

# THE INTERNATIONAL SOCIALIST REVIEW.

VOL. III.

JULY, 1902.

NO. 1.

## A RETROSPECT.

### Lessons Drawn from the Socialist Movement from 1848 to 1895.



AS the February revolution of 1848 broke out we were all, as regards our views of the conditions and course of revolutionary movements, under the influence of previous historical experience, especially that of France. It was just this latter which had controlled all European history since 1789 and from which now once more the signal for a general upheaval had gone out. Hence it was natural and inevitable that our ideas of the nature and course of the "social" revolution proclaimed at Paris in February, 1848, the revolution of the proletariat, were strongly colored by recollections of the prototypes of 1789 to 1830. And particularly, as the Paris revolt found its echo in the victorious uprisings at Vienna, Milan, Berlin; as all Europe up to the Russian border was swept into the movement; as then in June at Paris the first great battle for supremacy was fought between proletariat and bourgeoisie; as even the victory of their own class so convulsed the bourgeoisie of all countries that they flew back again into the arms of the monarchic-feudal reactionists whom they had just overthrown; under all these circumstances there could be no doubt in our minds that the great decisive conflict had begun, and that it would have to be fought out in a single long revolutionary period with varying success, but that it could only end in the final victory of the proletariat.

After the defeats of 1849 we did not by any means share in the illusions of the political pseudo-democracy which was grouped around the outskirts of the provisional governments. This was counting on an early, once for all, decisive victory of the "people" over the "oppressors;" we were counting on a long struggle after the removal of the oppressors, a struggle between the antagonistic elements hidden in this very "people" itself. The pseudo-democracy was expecting from day to day a renewed outbreak; we declared as early as in autumn 1850 that at least the first chapter of

the revolutionary period was closed and that nothing more was to be expected until the outbreak of a new economic world crisis. And for this very reason, too, we were excommunicated as traitors to the revolution by the same people who afterwards almost without exception made their peace with Bismarck,—so far as Bismarck found them worth having.

But history has shown that we, too, were wrong, and has exposed our view at that time as an illusion; it has done more; it has not only demolished our error, it has also totally recast the conditions under which the proletariat has to fight. The 1848 method of warfare is to-day antiquated in every particular, and that is a point which at this opportunity deserves to be more closely examined.

All previous revolutions resulted in the displacement of one class government by another. All previous ruling classes were, however, only small minorities compared with the subject mass of the common people. A ruling minority was overthrown, in its stead another minority seized the helm of state, and remodeled the political institutions according to its own interests. In every case this new minority group was one which the progress of economic development had trained for and called to rulership, and for that very reason and only for that reason, it happened that at the time of the revolution the subject majority either took sides with it or at any rate acquiesced in it. But ignoring the concrete details of each particular case, the common form of all these revolutions was this, that they were minority revolutions. Even when the majority assisted, it was, consciously or unconsciously, only working in the interest of a minority; this fact, or even the passive non-resistance of the majority, gave to the minority the appearance of being the representative of the whole people.

After the first great victory the successful minority as a rule became divided; half was satisfied with what was already won, the other half wished to go farther yet and made new demands, which at least in part were in the real or apparent interest of the great mass of the people. These more radical demands were in particular instances carried through, but for the most part only temporarily; the more moderate party again got the upper hand, the latest gains were wholly or partly lost again. The radicals then raised the cry of "treason," or attributed their defeat to accident. In fact, however, matters stood about so;—the results of the first victory were made secure only by another victory over the more radical party. This done, and thereby the immediate demands of the moderates being attained, the radicals and their following disappeared again from the stage.

All the revolutions of modern times, beginning with the great

English revolution of the seventeenth century, showed these features, which seemed inseparable from every revolutionary struggle. They appeared to be also applicable to the struggles of the proletariat for its emancipation; all the more applicable, as in 1848 the few people could be counted who understood even in a general way the direction in which this emancipation was to be sought. The proletarian masses themselves even in Paris after the victory were still absolutely in the dark as to the course to pursue. And yet the movement was there, instinctive, spontaneous, irrepressible. Was not that exactly the condition in which a revolution was bound to succeed, though led, it is true, by a minority, but this time not in the interest of a minority, but in the truest interest of the majority. If in all the more prolonged revolutionary periods the great masses of the people had been so easily won over by the merely plausible inducements of ambitious minorities, how could they be less accessible to ideas which were the purest reflex of their economic situation, which were nothing else but the clear, intelligent expression of their own wants, wants as yet not understood by themselves and only indistinctly felt? It is true this revolutionary temper of the masses had nearly always and generally very soon given way to lassitude or even to a reaction into the opposite attitude, as soon as the illusion had vanished and undeception had taken place.

Here, however, it was not a question of dazzling offers merely, but a question of promoting the most vital interests of the great majority itself,—interests which, it is true, at that time were by no means clearly seen by this great majority, but which in the course of practical enforcement were bound soon enough to become clear to it by the convincing force of experience. And now when in the spring of 1850 the development of the bourgeois republic which arose out of the “social” revolution of 1848 had concentrated all actual power in the hands of the great-bourgeoisie, and this having monarchical inclinations too; and when on the other hand this same development had grouped all other classes of society, both peasants and small-bourgeoisie, around the proletariat in such a way that in and after the joint victory the controlling factor would be, not those others, but the proletariat itself, grown sharp-witted through experience—was there not every prospect at hand for turning a minority revolution into a majority revolution?

History has shown that we, and all who thought like us, were wrong. It has made it plain that the condition of economic development on the continent at that time was not yet ripe enough by far for the abolition of capitalist production; it has proved this by the economic revolution which since 1848 has transformed the whole continent and has for the first time effectively naturalized



large-scale industry in France, Austria, Hungary, Poland and, more recently, in Russia, while out of Germany it has actually made an industrial state of the first rank,—all on a capitalist basis, which system therefore in 1848 was still capable of great expansion. Moreover, it is just this industrial revolution which first brought about clearness everywhere in class relations; which shoved aside a lot of middle men who had come down from the early manufacturing period and in eastern Europe even from the guild system; which created a genuine bourgeoisie and a genuine factory proletariat and pushed them to the front place in the social development. Thereby, however, the struggle of these two great classes, a struggle which in 1848 existed outside of England only in Paris, and at most in some few great industrial centers, has spread for the first time over all Europe and reached an intensity which in 1848 was inconceivable. Then there were many confused sectarian gospels with their different panaceas; to-day the single transparently clear and universally recognized theory of Marx, which sharply formulates the ultimate aims of the struggle; then, masses separated and differentiated by locality and nationality, bound together only by a feeling of common suffering, undeveloped, tossed helplessly back and forth between enthusiasm and despair; to-day one great international army of socialists, unceasingly advancing, daily growing in numbers, organization, discipline, intelligence and certainty of victory. If even this mighty army of the proletariat has not yet attained its object, if far from wresting victory at one grand stroke, it has to press slowly forward from one position to another in a hard, tenacious struggle, this proves once for all how impossible it was in 1848 to effect the transformation of society by a mere sudden onslaught.

A bourgeoisie, split into two dynastic monarchical factions, but which demanded before everything else peace and security for its financial transactions; confronting it a proletariat, conquered but still threatening, and around which the small-tradesmen and peasants were grouping themselves more and more; the constant threatening of a violent outbreak, which after all offered no prospect of a final solution,—that was the situation fitted as if made to order, for the forcible usurpation of the pseudo-democratic pretender, Louis Bonaparte, y-clept the Third. On December 2, 1851, with the aid of the army, he put an end to the strained situation and secured internal peace for Europe in order to beatify it with a new era of wars. The period of revolutions from the bottom up was for the time being closed; there followed a period of revolution from the top down.

The set back of 1851 towards imperialism gave new proof of the unripeness of the proletarian aspirations of that time. But it was itself destined to create the conditions under which they

must ripen. Internal peace secured the full development of the new industrial life; the necessity of keeping the army busy and of turning the revolutionary activities away from home engendered wars in which Bonaparte under the pretense of giving effect to the "nationality principle," sought to rake up annexations to France. His imitator, Bismarck, adopted the same policy for Prussia; he played his political grab-game, his revolution from the top, in 1866 against the German confederation and Austria, and not less against the recalcitrant Chamber of Deputies in Prussia. But Europe was too small for two Bonapartes, and so the irony of history would have it that Bismarck should overthrow Bonaparte and that King William of Prussia should restore not only the small-German empire, but also the French republic. The general result, however, was this, that in Europe the autonomy and inner unity of the large nations, with the exception of Poland, had become a reality; true, it was only within relatively modest limits, but yet far enough so that the developing process of the working class was no longer materially hindered by national complications. The grave diggers of the revolution of 1848 had become the executors of its will; and beside them arose the proletariat, the heir of 1848, already threatening, in the Internationale.

After the war of 1870-1871, Bonaparte disappears from the stage and Bismarck's mission is completed, so that he can now subside again to the level of an ordinary country squire. But the closing act of this period is formed by the Paris Commune. A treacherous attempt by Thiers to steal the cannons of the Paris National Guard called forth a successful revolt. It was again demonstrated that in Paris no other revolution is possible any more, except a proletarian one. After the victory the leadership fell uncontested into the lap of the working class, just as a matter of course. And again it was shown how impossible it was even then, twenty years after the former effort, for the leadership of the working class to be successful. On one hand France left Paris in the lurch and stood by looking on while it was bleeding under the bullets of McMahon; on the other hand the Commune wasted its strength in a barren quarrel of the two disagreeing factions, the Blanquists, who formed the majority, and the Proudhonists, who formed the minority, neither of which knew what to do. The victory of 1871, which came as a gift, proved just as barren as the forcible overthrow of 1848.

With the fall of the Paris Commune it was thought that the militant proletariat was everlastingly buried past resurrection. But quite to the contrary, its most vigorous growth dates from the Commune and the Franco-Prussian war. The complete transformation of the whole military system by bringing the entire able-bodied population into the armies, now running up into the



millions, and by the introduction of firearms, cannon and explosives of hitherto unheard of power, put a sudden end to the Napoleonic war era and assured a peaceful industrial development by making impossible any war other than a world war of unprecedented gruesomeness and of absolutely incalculable consequences. On the other hand, the increase of the army budget in a geometrical progression forced the taxes up to an uncollectible point, and thereby drove the poorer classes into the arms of socialism. The annexation of Alsace-Lorraine, which was the immediate cause of the mad competition in preparations for war, might goad the French and German bourgeoisie into chauvinism towards each other; but for the workingmen of both countries it was only a new bond of unity. And the anniversary of the Paris Commune became the first general holiday of the entire proletariat.

The war of 1870-1871 and the overthrow of the Commune had, as Marx foretold, shifted the center of gravity of the European labor movement for the present from France to Germany. In France it took, of course, years to recover from the blood-letting of May, 1871. In Germany, on the contrary, where industry was developing faster and faster, forced on in hothouse fashion by the providential milliards from France, the social democracy was growing faster yet and more enduring. Thanks to the intelligence with which the German workingmen made use of the universal suffrage, introduced in 1866, the astounding growth of the party is revealed to all in incontestable figures. In 1871, 102,000 social democratic votes; in 1874, 352,000; in 1877, 493,000. Then came the high official recognition of these gains in the shape of the anti-socialist law. The party was for a moment demoralized; the number of votes in 1881 fell to 312,000. But that relapse was soon overcome, and then under the pressure of the anti-socialist law, and without a press, without a recognized organization, without the right of association or of assembly, the growth began to increase more rapidly than ever. In 1884, 550,000 votes! in 1887, 763,000; in 1890, 1,427,000. Then the hand of the state was palsied. The anti-socialist law disappeared; the number of socialist votes rose to 1,787,000, over a quarter of the total votes cast. The government and the ruling classes had exhausted all their expedients; they were useless, aimless, resultless. The tangible proofs of their impotence which the authorities, from night watchman to imperial chancellor, got shoved under their noses and that, too, from the despised workingmen, were numbered by millions. The state had got to the end of its Latin, the workingmen were only at the beginning of theirs.

Moreover, in addition to this, the German workingmen had

done their cause a second great service, besides the first one, consisting merely in their existence as the strongest, best disciplined, and most rapidly growing Socialist party; they had shown their comrades of all countries a new weapon, and one of the keenest, in showing them how to use the ballot.

Universal suffrage had long existed in France, but had come into disrepute through the misuse which the Napoleonic government had made for it. After the Commune there was no labor party in existence to make use of it. In Spain, too, it had existed since the republic, but in Spain it was always the custom of all the real opposition parties to refrain from voting. And in Switzerland, too, the experiences with universal suffrage were anything but encouraging for a labor party. The revolutionary workingmen of the Romance countries had become accustomed to look upon the ballot as a snare, as an instrument of oppression manipulated by the government. In Germany it was different. The Communist Manifesto had already proclaimed the winning of universal suffrage, of democracy, as one of the first and most important tasks of the militant proletariat, and Lassalle had taken up this point again. And when Bismarck saw that he was forced to introduce this franchise as the only means of getting the masses interested in his plans, our workingmen at once took the matter seriously and sent August Bebel into the first constitutional convention. And from that day on they have used the ballot in a manner that has repaid them a thousand fold and has served as an example to the workingmen of all countries. They have transformed the ballot, in the words of the program of the French Marxians, "*de moyen de duperie, qu'il a ete jusqu'ici, en instrument d'emancipation*;" from a means of jugglery, which it has been heretofore, into an instrument of emancipation. And if universal suffrage had offered no other advantage than to allow us to count ourselves every three years; and by a regularly certified and unexpectedly rapid increase of votes to raise in equal degree the confidence of the workers and the terror of their opponents, and thus to become our best means of propaganda; and to inform us exactly as to our own strength and as to that of all opposing parties, and thereby give us a standard for proportioning our activity such as could not be equalled; and to save us both from untimely hesitation and from untimely rashness;—if that were the only benefit which we derived from the franchise, even then it would be enough and more than enough. But it has done far more. It gave us in election campaigns an unequalled opportunity to come in contact with the masses where they still stood aloof from us, and to force all parties to defend their views and actions before all the people against our attacks; and it also opened to our representatives in Parliament, a forum from which they could talk to their opponents in Parliament as well as to the



masses outside with an entirely different tone of authority and freedom from what they could use in the press and in meetings. What good did the anti-Socialist law do the government and the bourgeoisie so long as the election campaigns and the Socialist speeches in Parliament were continually nullifying it?

Moreover, with this successful use of the ballot, a wholly new method of proletarian warfare had gone into effect, which was rapidly extended. It was found that the political institutions, by means of which the supremacy of the bourgeoisie is organized, afford further handholds by which the working class can attack these very institutions. The party took part in the elections for State Legislatures, Aldermen and industrial courts and contested against the bourgeoisie for every office in the filling of which a sufficient number of the proletariat had anything to say. And thus it happened that the bourgeoisie and the government came to a pass where they feared the lawful activity of the labor party far more than its unlawful activity; it dreaded the results of an election more than those of a rebellion. For here, too, the conditions of the struggle had materially changed. The old style rebellion, the street fight with barricades, which down to 1848 gave the final decision everywhere, had become decidedly antiquated.

Let us harbor no illusions on this point; an actual victory of a revolt over the military force in a street fight, a victory as between two armies, is a thing of the rarest occurrence. Moreover, the insurgents had seldom aimed at this. Their only object was to soften the troops by moral influences, such as in a conflict between armies of two warring countries would be of no effect at all, or at any rate in a far smaller degree. If this plan succeeds the troops refuse to obey orders or the officers lose their presence of mind and the revolt is successful. If this plan does not succeed, nevertheless, even in case the military is fewer in numbers, the result shows the superiority of their better equipment and training, of the unified leadership, of the well-planned arrangement of forces and their discipline. The most that an insurrection can attain in real tactical action is the scientific construction and defense of a single barricade. Mutual support, the disposition and utilization of reserves, in short the assistance and co-operation of the separate divisions, which is indispensable for the defense even of a single district, to say nothing of the whole of a large city, is very imperfect, and for the most part wholly unattainable; concentration of forces upon a vital point is out of the question. A passive defense is the characteristic form of the struggle. The attack will extend here and there to occasional sallies or flank movements, but only as exceptions, for as a rule it will be confined to occupying the positions abandoned by the



retiring troops. Then, further, the military is supplied with artillery and with completely equipped and trained battalions of pioneers which the insurgents in almost all cases wholly lack. No wonder, therefore, that even those barricade fights which were conducted with the most heroic bravery, as at Paris in June, 1848, at Vienna in October, 1848, and at Dresden in May, 1849, ended with the suppression of the revolt as soon as the officers of the army, unhampered by political considerations, fought according to purely military principles and the soldiers remained trustworthy.

The numerous successes of insurgents down to 1848 are due to very manifold causes. At Paris in July, 1830, and in February, 1848, as also in most of the Spanish street fights, there stood between the insurgents and the military a citizens' guard, which either sided directly with the revolt or by its lukewarm and hesitating attitude caused the regular troops also to waver, and in addition to that, furnished the insurgents with arms. Wherever this civil guard at the start took a stand against the revolt, as in June, 1848, at Paris, the insurgents were defeated. At Berlin, in 1848, the people won partly through an important addition of fresh forces during the night and on the morning of the 19th of March, partly on account of the fatigue and lack of care suffered by the troops, and partly on account of the hesitation of the authorities. But in all cases where a victory was won it was because the troops mutinied, or because the officers were lacking in determination, or because their hands were tied.

Therefore, even in the classical period of street fighting, the barricade was more of a moral than a material force. It was a means for breaking the loyalty of the army. If it accomplished this, the victory was won; if not, the cause was lost.

Even in 1849 the chances were already poor enough. The bourgeoisie everywhere had gone over to the side of the governments; "culture and property" greeted and treated the troops marching out against the insurgents. The barricade had lost its charm. The soldiers no longer saw behind it the "people," but only rebels, rioters, plunderers, "dividers-up," the outcasts of society; the officers had in time become skilled in the tactical forms of street fighting; they no longer marched out straight ahead and unprotected against the improvised breastworks, but went around them through gardens, courts and houses. And this course, with a little skill, was successful in nine cases out of ten.

And since then many things have changed and all to the advantage of the military. Though the large cities have become larger, so also have the armies. Paris and Berlin have not quadrupled since 1848, but their garrisons have been increased more than that. By means of the railroads these garrisons can be dou-

bled in twenty-four hours, and in forty-eight hours can be expanded into gigantic armies. The weapons of these enormous hosts are incomparably more effective than formerly. In 1848 they had only the smooth bore, percussion-cap, muzzle-loader; to-day the small calibre magazine breech-loader, which shoots four times as far, ten times as accurate, and ten times as fast as the other. At that time they had only the comparatively ineffective solid balls and cartridges of the artillery; to-day the percussion shells, a single one of which is sufficient to demolish the strongest barricade. At that time the pick of the pioneer for breaking through walls; to-day the dynamite bomb.

On the other hand, for the insurgents, all the conditions have become worse. A revolt with which all layers of the population sympathize can hardly come again. In the class struggle all the middle layers of society will probably never rally around the proletariat so exclusively that the reactionary party which rallies to the bourgeoisie will almost disappear. The "people" therefore will always appear to be divided, and thereby a powerful lever is wanting which was so exceedingly effective in 1848. Even if more trained soldiers are found on the side of the insurgents, it will be so much the more difficult to arm them. The hunters' and sportsmen's guns from the retail stores, even if the police should not have rendered them unserviceable by removing part of the lock as a precautionary measure, cannot by any means compete with the magazine gun of the soldiers even at close range. Up to 1848 a man could manufacture the necessary ammunition himself out of powder and lead; but to-day the cartridge is different for every gun, and only in one particular is it alike everywhere, viz., in that it is a technical product of large scale industry, and therefore cannot be prepared extempore, and therefore the most of the guns are useless so long as one has not the ammunition specially fitted for them. Finally the new districts of the great cities have been laid out with long, straight, broad streets, as if made with special reference to operations with modern cannons and small arms. The revolutionist would be insane who would deliberately select the new workingmen's districts in the north and east of Berlin for a barricade fight.

Does the reader now understand why the ruling classes are so anxious by all means to get us where the rifle cracks and the saber slashes? And why they to-day accuse us of cowardice because we do not straightway betake ourselves to the street, where we are beforehand certain of a defeat? And why they so passionately beseech us to be good enough to play cannon fodder just for once?

These gentlemen are wasting both their prayers and their dares for nothing and less than nothing. We are not so green as



all that. They might just as well ask their enemy in the next war to follow the line formation used by Frederick the Great, or the formation in columns of entire divisions à la Wagram and Waterloo, and that, too, with the old flintlock gun in the hand. As conditions have changed for warfare, so not less for the class struggle. The period of sudden onslaughts, of revolutions carried out by small conscious minorities at the head of unconscious masses, is past. Where the question involves the complete transformation of the social organization, there the masses themselves must be consulted, must themselves have already grasped what the struggle is about and what they are to stand for. This is what the history of the last fifty years has taught us. But in order that the masses may understand what is to be done, long and persistent work is needed, and it is just this work that we are now doing, and that, too, with a success which drives our opponents to despair.

In the Latin countries also people see more and more that the old tactics have to be revised. They have everywhere followed the German example of using the ballot and of winning every position which is accessible to them. In France where the ground has been broken up for over 100 years by revolution upon revolution, where there is not a single party which has not furnished its share of conspiracies, insurrections and all other revolutionary doings; in France, where, as the result of this condition, the government is by no means certain of the army, and where the circumstances generally are far more favorable for an insurrectional venture than in Germany,—even in France the Socialists are coming to understand better and better that no enduring victory is possible for them unless they first win the great mass of the people;—that means there the peasants. Slow propaganda work and parliamentary activity are recognized there, too, as the next task of the party. The results were not lacking. Not only has a whole string of municipal councils been captured; even in the Chamber of Deputies there are fifty Socialists, and these have already overthrown three Cabinets and one President of the republic. In Belgium last year the workmen forced the granting of the electoral franchise and won in a fourth of the voting districts. In Switzerland, in Italy, in Denmark, yes, even in Bulgaria and Roumania, the Socialists are represented in Parliament. In Austria all parties are agreed that our entrance into the imperial council can no longer be prevented. We are bound to get in, that is certain; the only question yet is, by what door? And even in Russia whenever the celebrated Zemskij Sobor shall be assembled, that national convention which young Nicholas is trying in vain to prevent, we can count on it with certainty that we shall be represented there too.

It goes without saying that our foreign comrades do not relinquish their right of revolution. The right of revolution is after all the only actually "historical right," the only right upon which all modern states without exception rest, including even Mecklenburg, whose revolution of the nobility was ended in 1755 by the inheritance agreement,—that glorious charter of feudalism which is still in force to-day. The right of revolution is so irrefutably recognized in the public consciousness that General von Boguslawski out of this popular right alone derives the right of forcible usurpation which he justifies on behalf of the Emperor.

But whatever may happen in other countries, the German social democracy occupies a particular position, and hence has at least for the present a particular task. The two million voters which it sends to the ballot box, together with the young men and the women who, as non-voters, stand behind them, constitute the largest and compactest mass, the decisive corps of the international proletarian army. This mass furnishes already over a quarter of the votes cast; and it grows unceasingly, as shown by the elections for the Reichstag, for the separate state legislatures; for the municipal councils and for the industrial courts. Its growth goes on as spontaneously, steadily, and uninterruptedly, and at the same time as quietly as a process of nature. All the efforts of the government against it have shown themselves to be futile. We can to-day count on two and a quarter million voters. If that keeps up, we shall by the end of the century win the greater part of the middle strata of society, both small tradesmen and peasants, and shall become the determining power in the land before which all other powers must bow down, whether they want to or not. To keep this growth going uninterruptedly until of itself it overtops the prevailing system of government, is our chief task. And there is only one means by which this steady increase of the militant Socialist forces in Germany could be momentarily checked and even set back for a time, viz., a conflict with the army on a large scale, a blood-letting like that of 1871 at Paris. In the long run even this would be overcome. Take a party which runs up into the millions and all the magazine guns of Europe and America together would not be sufficient to shoot it out of existence. But the normal development would be checked, and the end of the conflict would be delayed, prolonged and accompanied with heavier sacrifices.

The irony of history turns everything upside down. We, the "revolutionists," the "revolvers," prosper far better by lawful measures than by unlawful measures and violence. The law and order parties, as they call themselves, go to ruin under the legal conditions which they themselves have established. They cry out in despair with Odilon Barrot; *la legalité nous tue*, "lawfulness



is killing us;" while we, under this lawfulness are getting firm muscles and rosy cheeks and are the picture of eternal life. And if we do not so completely lose our wits as to let ourselves be drawn into a street fight just to please them, then there remains nothing else for them to do finally except to break down this lawfulness themselves, which has proved so disadvantageous to them.

For the present they are making new laws against revolts. Again everything is turned upside down. These anti-revolt fanatics of to-day, are they not themselves the revolvers of yesterday? For example, did we conjure up the civil war of 1866? Did we drive the King of Hanover, the electoral Prince of Hessen, the Duke of Nassau from their legitimate and hereditary lands, and then annex these countries? And now these smashers of the German confederation and of three grace-of-God crowns complain about revolt! *Quis tulerit Gracchos de seditione querentes?* Who could permit Bismarck's worshipers to complain about revolting?

Meanwhile let them pass their anti-revolt laws, and make them still more stringent: let them turn the whole criminal code into caoutchouc; they will accomplish nothing except to furnish new proof of their impotence. In order to get at the social democracy effectively they will have to take entirely different measures. The social democratic revolt, which just now finds its greatest advantage in observing the laws, can only be checked by a counter-revolt of the law and order party which cannot exist without breaking the laws. Herr Roessler, the Prussian bureaucrat, and Herr von Boguslawski, the Prussian general, have pointed out to them the only way by which perhaps they can yet get even with the workingmen who will not let themselves be enticed into a street fight, breach of the constitution, dictatorship, a return to absolutism, *regis voluntas suprema lex!* Courage, therefore, gentlemen, no lip-puckering will answer here; you have got to whistle!

But do not forget that the German empire, as well as all the small states composing it, and in general all modern states, are the product of a treaty; a treaty first of the princes among themselves, second of the princes with the people. If one side breaks the treaty, the whole treaty falls, and the other side is then no longer bound either.

It is now 1600 years ago, almost to a year, that likewise a dangerous revolutionary party was carrying on its work in the Roman empire. It undermined religion and all the foundations of the state. It denied absolutely that the will of the Emperor was the supreme law; it was fatherlandless, international; it spread out over all parts of the empire, from Gaul to Asia, and even beyond the limits of the empire. It had for a long time worked under-

ground and in secret, but for some time past it considered itself strong enough to come out openly into the light. This revolutionary party, which was known by the name of Christians, also had a large representation in the army. Whole legions were Christian. When they were ordered to attend the sacrifice ceremonies of the established heathen religion to perform the honors of the occasion, the revolutionary soldiers carried their impudence so far that by way of protest they stuck into their helmets peculiar emblems—crosses. Even the customary floggings by the officers, with the cat-o'-nine tails of the barracks, were fruitless. The Emperor Diocletian was no longer able to look quietly on while order, obedience and discipline in his army were being subverted. He took hold energetically while there was yet time. He issued an anti-Socialist,—or, rather, an anti-Christian—law. Assemblies of the revolvers were forbidden, their meeting halls closed or even torn down, the Christian emblems, crosses, etc., were forbidden the same as red handkerchiefs in Saxony. Christians were declared incapable of holding state offices, and could not even become lance corporals in the army. As they did not yet have at that time judges so carefully trained to observe a "respect for the person" as contemplated by Herr von Koeller's anti-revolt bill, the Christians were forbidden outright to resort to the courts at all. This exception law also proved ineffective. The Christians tore it down from the walls with contempt, aye, it is said that while the Emperor was in Nicomedia they set fire to the palace over his head. He revenged himself by the great persecution of Christians which took place in the year 303 of our era. It was the last of its kind; and it was so effective that seventeen years later the majority of the army consisted of Christians and the next succeeding monarch of the whole Roman empire, Constantine, called by the priests the Great, proclaimed Christianity as the state religion.

Frederich Engels.

(Being the introduction to Marx's *Class Struggles in France*.)

Translated by Marcus Hitch.

London, March 6, 1895.



## The Socialist Party of France After the Elections.

**R**EGARDING the general elections which took place in France on April 27 and May 11 of this year, our American comrades have certainly had thus far only incomplete and contradictory reports. Especially everything that has to do with the situation of our party has been transmitted to them through bourgeois agencies, very skillful in concealing our successes when we were victorious and still more so in magnifying our defeats when we were beaten.

In places where Socialism is still in its first stage of propaganda, where it appears new-born, and shows as yet no great expansive force, it may enter into electoral contests without taking more than slight account of the general political situation. But where, as in France, the Socialist party has become an important factor in the national life, it is obliged to take account of the immediate results of its acts and its tactics, to take political contingencies into consideration and to act accordingly.

In Europe, where there are still vestiges of the regimes of absolute monarchy, feudalism and clerical reaction, the Socialist party is obliged to distinguish between the enemies of the working class and to support the "advanced" sections of the bourgeoisie against the reactionary sections. Not even the most uncompromising of our comrades, whose conception has reached the greatest doctrinal rigidity,—not even these escape this common law, whether it be our Socialist brothers of Germany, allied with the progressives against the agrarians, our Belgian comrades united with the liberals against the clericals, our friends of Italy allied with the radicals, the progressives and the republicans against the reactionaries, or, again, our friends Hyndman, Quelch and Keir Hardie in England, struggling against the Tories by the side of radicals like Morley and the Irish Nationalist party,—everywhere it is the same phenomena that we recognize.

And by the way, Marx and Engels said as long ago as 1867 that the Socialist proletariat should always support the liberal section of the bourgeoisie "as often as it acted in a revolutionary fashion against absolute monarchy, bourgeois landed property and the petty bourgeoisie."

But we must needs be clear-headed when we speak of union with the bourgeois parties, and not confuse the two ideas of a momentary and provisional coalition with the advanced parties of the bourgeoisie and on the other hand of a permanent understanding, a normal alliance, not actuated by anything exceptional, and which might even end, as in the case with our ministerial-

ists in France, in the conception of a permanent participation by the Socialists in the central power of the bourgeoisie.

Between these two conceptions there is a deep gulf. The former permits Socialism to maintain its integrity as a party clearly distinct from all bourgeois parties; it permits it to pursue its own work of awakening in the laborers a clear-cut sense of the fundamental antagonism which exists between the bourgeoisie and the proletariat. It has led the Socialist parties of Germany, Belgium, Austria and Italy from victory to victory. The second conception, on the contrary, ends in setting up the idea of collaboration of classes as opposed to the class struggle, while for the clear and definite concept of the organization of the proletariat it substitutes the worst sort of confusion.

France was precipitated into the last electoral contest while in the gravest sort of a political situation. The great landed proprietors, the larger portion of the industrial capitalists, the feudal and clerical elements more or less opposed to the republican regime and desirous of re-establishing the monarchy,—all these had formed themselves into a formidable coalition to get control of the government and to use it at once against the bourgeois republican parties and against organized labor. It was under the mask of patriotism, working artfully on national sentiment, that the party calling itself "Nationalist" was thus established. It comprised the old Orleanist, Bonapartist and clerical Ultramontane parties, and also certain chauvinistic elements of the small bourgeoisie, like those called Jingoists in England, who declared with great vehemence that "'republicans' and 'democrats' are only other names for Socialists." These elements had formed a powerful organization, the *Ligue de la Patrie Française* (French Patriotic League), which at Paris controlled several large and widely circulated newspapers. A league called "*Les Dames Françaises*" (French Ladies), formed by the elegant women of the aristocracy and the upper bourgeoisie, set itself about raising enormous sums of money for the expenses of the electoral campaign, and the money expended by the *Ligue de la Patrie Française* is estimated at more than \$5,000,000.

As for the Socialist party, its situation at the opening of the battle was bad enough. On the one side, the "ministerialist" Socialists had exaggerated their concern for defending public liberty up to the point of tolerating the worst compromises, and often to the point of confounding themselves with the bourgeois "democratic" parties and totally forgetting the duty that as intelligent Socialists they owe to their class. On the other hand, by a natural but deplorable reaction the "Guesdist" and "Blanquist" Socialists, who have formed another organization under the name of "Revolutionary Socialist Union," have often exhibited an "impossibilism" quite analogous to that of your Deleonites.



It is true that in fact these comrades of the "Unité Socialiste Revolutionnaire," who had most bitterly declared their disdain for "republican defense," have, in presence of the facts, and once having entered on the electoral struggle, seen the need of acting more wisely. Apart from a few exceptional cases their attitude has been that of good and loyal Socialists, equally removed from compromises with the bourgeois parties and from clumsy acts of assistance to the parties of pure reaction.

The ministerialist Socialists thereupon greeted the Socialists of the "Unité Socialiste Revolutionnaire" with raillery and sarcasm, and instead of congratulating them on the correction of their absurd exaggerations (like those of your "Deleonites"), they declared triumphantly that the "Guesdists" and "Blanquists," once entered on the electoral contest, and in order to hold or gain seats in Parliament, had abandoned all their former tactics. As I wrote in Comrade Enrico Ferri's handsome new review, *Il Socialismo*, for May 25, this was an act of bad faith on the part of the ministerialist Socialists.

The French electoral law, like that of the principal countries of Europe, England excepted, provides for two ballots. At the first there are three, four or even five candidates to be voted for. At the second there remain but two, the two who have received the highest number of votes. Sometimes these two candidates at the second ballot are, for example, a reactionary nationalist and a democratic bourgeois republican, and then the Socialist voters who at the first poll registered their votes for one of their own number, do not hesitate to vote at the second ballot for the bourgeois republican against the reactionary.

On the contrary, in another district, there remain at the second ballot only the Socialist and the reactionary. Our friends are then justified in appealing for the votes of those who at the first ballot voted for the bourgeois radical, who happens to be only third in number of votes and consequently disappears at the second ballot. That is what all the Socialists do and what was done for example by our comrade Delory, Mayor of Lille, candidate of the "Unité Socialiste Revolutionnaire," and in reproaching him for it the ministerialist Socialists are I repeat, acting in bad faith. The anti-ministerialists had never seriously reproached the others for these coalitions on the second ballot. What they had criticised is the theory of permanent participation on the part of the Socialists in the central power of the bourgeoisie, that is to say, ministerialism. Consequently the ministerialists have no right to say that the candidates of the "Unité Socialiste Revolutionnaire" have done what they reproached the members of the "Parti Socialiste Français," or ministerialists, for doing.

The elections of April 27 and May 11 of the year have resulted

in a most complete check for the reactionary nationalists, and in spite of the enormous sums of money expended by them, in spite of the formidable effort that they made, the republican parties are completely victorious. The Socialists can only rejoice at this, for a victory of the reactionaries of the *Patrie Française* would have put back the progress of Socialism in France by at least ten years. It would have been impossible for our comrades for a long time to follow up the organization of the laborers as a class party; all their energy would have been called out by the work of defending political liberty represented in the bourgeois democracy.

This bitter struggle between republican and nationalist so complicated the task of our party that it was often difficult to proclaim clearly the ideas that are distinctively Socialist, or to bring the voting masses to consider them, under circumstances where the economic question was reduced to the second place.

Nevertheless our party has little to complain of in the issue of the struggle; if it has not made such considerable progress as it should have made, it has none the less increased its strength, and in certain regions its progress has been surprising.

The "ministerialist" tactics, the presence of an old member of the Socialist parliamentary group in the democratic but capitalist government of M. Waldeck-Rousseau, must according to the partisans of these tactics have brought over to our ideas innumerable masses of timid and artless voters. Socialism, which till then had passed for a doctrine of "savages," of people without hearth or home, now becoming governmental, "decent" and "polite," would convert to itself all those whom its revolutionary character had frightened away. That is an illusion common to all those who incline toward that dangerous tendency known as "State Socialism."

In France, when the election returns of this year came in, the awakening from their illusions must have been a rude shock for certain people. The Socialist gain, measured by the number of deputies in Parliament, or by the number of votes cast, is on the whole small, and where there is evident progress it is impossible to attribute it to the attraction exercised by "ministerialism." On the contrary, the districts where the progress of socialism is most marked are those where the tendencies of the active workers are clearly revolutionary.

In the department of the Iser, in the region of the Alps, where our ideas had brought together 72,861 votes in 1898, we had but 27,861 this year. But in the department of Saone et Loire, in the region of Lyons, where we had 2,069 votes in 1898, as a result of the great strikes of the miners of Montceau-les-Mines and of the metal workers of Crenot and Chalon, we now have 22,539. Again, the Loire, including the mining region of St. Etienne and

the textile region of Roannes increases its Socialist vote from 19,357 to 32,456.

In other regions where the Socialists have sacrificed more to ministerialism, as, for example, on the coast of the Mediterranean, our ideas have also progressed, but it is impossible to say that the ministerial tactics have been of advantage to the Socialists of these regions. On the contrary, it is certain that without the ministerialism their progress would have been greater.

Among these departments on the Mediterranean should be mentioned that of the Bouches du Rhone (around Marseilles) where we obtained 36,214 votes in 1898 and 43,868 this time, that of Gard, where we had, four years ago, 21,899 votes, and now 36,637; Herault, where we had 12,603 and now have 15,414; Var, where we had 16,792 votes and now count 19,569.

In the region of the north and of Paris, for various reasons, in the terrific assault of the reactionaries, socialist divisions, economic depression, we have in general simply maintained our positions.

In Paris (city and suburbs) we obtained 197,000 votes in 1898; we have 200,499 in 1902.\* In the department of the North the Socialists polled 82,000 votes in 1898, this time 80,587. It is evident that in this great industrial region Socialism is not progressing as we might fairly have hoped. For this there are various reasons: alcoholism, the depressing force of the Catholic church, and the terrible tyranny exercised by the employers explain up to a certain point the slowness of our growth and this time a slight check. There are, however, other causes, and among them there must be some for which the Socialists themselves are responsible.

In another department of the northern region, that of Hisne, although the Socialist deputy of the district of Guise, Eugene Fourniere, was beaten, there was, nevertheless, a considerable increase in our vote, which passes from 12,213 to 17,600.

In the department of the Rhone, around Lyons, the progress realized by our party is also perceptible. Our vote increased from 28,181 to 32,397. Also at Cher, in the region of the Center, it increased from 16,596 to 20,309.

If we examine the different regions of France with regard to the Socialist vote and the vote obtained by each Socialist organi-

---

\* In the Paris election returns in 1898 those who voted for such deputies as Pascal Grousset and Milleraud were counted as Socialists, though the Socialism of the candidates can evidently be contested. However, the great majority of those who voted for them were Socialists. If we should subtract their votes from the total we should have in 1898 about 183,000 and in 1902, 189,200. The figures of the Socialist votes are made from the results of the first ballot, April 27, for the results of the second ballot do not admit of exact calculation.



zation, and if we class them accordingly, by the proportion of Socialist voters to the total number of inhabitants, we shall arrive at the following figures:

1. Region of the Mediterranean (departments of Bouches-du-Rhone, Gard, Var, Herault, Aude, Vaucluse), 2,470,000 inhabitants, and 132,671 Socialist votes, divided as follows:

66,520 for the Parti Socialiste Francais.

27,559 for the Unité Socialiste Revolutionnaire.

33,210 for the Federations Autonomes (composed of Socialists who have preferred not to join either of the two large organizations.

2. Region of Lyons (Rhone, Loire, Saone-et-Loire), 2,100,000 inhabitants and 87,390 Socialist votes.

49,323 for the P. S. F.

34,025 for the U. S. R.

4,042 for the A.

3. Region du Nord (Nord Aisne, Pas de Calais, Somme), 3,995,000 inhabitants, and 153,200 Socialist votes, of which 63,688 were cast for the P. S. F., 80,921 for U. S. R., and 8,630 for the F. A.

4. Region du Centre (Cher, Allier, Indre), 1,110,000 inhabitants, and 48,148 Socialist votes, of which 15,277 were for the P. S. F., 30,201 for the U. S. R. and 2,670 for the F. A.

5. Region Parisienne (Seine, Seine et Oise, Oise, Eure et Loire, Seine et Marne), 5,286,000 inhabitants, and 214,100 Socialist votes, of which 89,066 were for the P. S. F., 85,067 for the U. S. R., and 28,961 for the F. A.

6. Region des Ardennes et de la Champagne (Ardennes, Marne, Aube, Haute Marne), 1,298,000 inhabitants, and 35,746 Socialist votes, of which 22,037 were for the P. S. F. and 13,581 for the U. S. R.

7. Region des Alpes (Isere, Hautes Alpes, Basses Alpes, Alpes Maritimes et Drome), 1,399,000 inhabitants, and 26,083 Socialist votes, of which none were for the P. S. F. (who have no organizations in this region), 22,483 were for the U. S. R. and 3,600 for the F. A.

8. Bourgogne et Jura (Cote d'or, Yonne, Ain, Jura, Nièvre), with 1,719,000 inhabitants, and 32,258 Socialist votes, of which 27,977 were for the P. S. F. and 2,077 for the U. S. R.

9. Region de la Saintonge et de Poitou (Deux-Sevres, Charente, Charent Inferieure, et Vienne), with 1,530,000 inhabitants, and 21,760 Socialist votes, of which 14,719 were for the P. S. F. and 6,991 for the U. S. R.

10. Region d'Auvergne et Haut Languedoc (Puy de Dome, Aveyron, Lozere, Haute Vienne), with 2,105,000 inhabitants, and 36,819 Socialist votes, of which 24,355 were for the P. S. F., 7,770 for the U. S. R., and 2,899 for the F. A.

11. Region de Vouraine, d'Anjou et du Maine (Indre et Loire, Lou et Cher, Maine et Loire, Mayenne, Sarthe, Loire), with 2,264,000 inhabitants, and 18,836 Socialist votes, of which 13,020 were for the P. S. F., 2,961 for the U. S. R., and 2,738 for the F. A.

12. Region Girondine (Gironde, Dordogne, Landes, Lot et Lot d' Garvin), with 2,178,000 inhabitants, and 18,499 Socialist votes, of which 8,320 were for the P. S. F. and 10,179 for the U. S. R.

13. Region des Pyrenees et Bas Languedoc (Haute Pyrenees, Basses Pyrenees, Pyrenees et Orientals, Haut Garonne, Gars), with 2,570,000 inhabitants, and 15,563 Socialist votes, of which 10,362 were for the P. S. F. and 5,178 for the U. S. R.

14. Normandie (Seine Inferieure, Eure, Calvados, Manche, Orne), with 2,470,000 inhabitants, and 12,845 Socialist votes, of which 12,222 were for the P. S. F. and 622 for the U. S. R.

15. Bretagne (Finisterre, Cotes du Nord, Morbihan, Ile et Vilaine, Loire Inferieure), with 3,215,000 inhabitants, and 18,091 Socialist votes, of which 2,750 were for the P. S. F., 2,493 for the U. S. R., and 12, 558 for the F. A.

16. Lorraine et Franche Comte, with 1,830,000 inhabitants, and 2,232 Socialist votes, of which 430 were for the P. S. F. and 1,830 for the U. S. R.

It occurred to me that this classification of France from a Socialist point of view might interest our American comrades, and especially the readers of the International Socialist Review who enjoy scientific processes of analysis, precise facts and figures. I should add that until now this classification had not been made in France. It had been thought sufficient to give the enumeration of the Socialist votes, simply by departments. Now our departments, created a hundred years ago, during the Revolution, in an artificial fashion, do not always represent anything well defined. On the contrary the regions, such as I have enumerated them, correspond to characteristic historical formations, and represent actual groupings. This classification shows us that the regions of France where Socialism is strongest are the regions of the Mediterranean, of Lyons, the Center, the North and the region of Paris.

The truth is that the regions of Lyons, of the Center and of the North are especially characterized by a very clear class-consciousness on the part of their active Socialists. On the contrary, in the region of the Mediterranean, and that of Paris, the Socialist movement assumes the forms of an "advanced" movement, democratic and slightly Jacobin. In the Mediterranean region especially, the 132,000 Socialist voters are in great part not industrial laborers, but "democratic" peasants, quite republican in their ideas, and wishing to belong to the most "advanced" party, but

not always having a very clear idea of socialism. Thus for example, in the department of the Gard, where three out of six of the Deputies to Parliament are members of the Socialist group, most of the Socialist voters are small proprietors of Vignobles, in whose eyes the Socialist movement is a matter of politics rather than economics.

On the contrary, at Lyons, at St. Etienne, at Montceau les Mines, at Lille, at Roubaix, at Montlucon, and at Commentay, that is to say, in the regions of Lyons, the North and the Center, the Socialist voters, who number about 280,000, are mostly metal-workers, textile-workers and miners.

If we classify the Socialist votes according to organizations, we have the following results:

The "Parti Socialiste Français," which includes on the one hand the ministerialist Socialist elements and on the other hand some federations not ministerialist, but very closely allied, mustered 316,053 votes in the departments and 84,320 at Paris, a total of 432,373 votes.

The "Unité Socialiste Revolutionnaire," which unites the old organizations of the "Parti Ouvrier Français" (Guesdists) and "Parti Socialiste Revolutionnaire" (Blanquist), polled 262,050 votes in the provinces and 76,147 in Paris, in all 338,197.

The Federations which have remained independent and the old "Allemanist" organization ("Parti Ouvrier Socialiste Revolutionnaire") received 67,961 at Paris, 96,602 in all.

We have thus a total of 863,159 Socialist votes; by adding the votes of candidates like Pascal Grousset and Millerand, which we have not counted, and those cast for the Deputy Calvinhac, who sits with the Socialist group, but whose candidacy has not a very clear Socialist character, we obtain a total of 893,720 Socialist votes.

In 1898 the Socialist party cast 790,000 votes; there is then an evident increase, though less than what we might have hoped.

As to the number of candidates elected, we had thirty-nine in the old legislature; in the new we have forty-four (omitting Grousset and Millerand in both cases). Of those elected, fourteen belong to the group of the "Unité Socialiste Revolutionnaire" and thirty-two to the "Parliamentary Socialist Group," which includes twenty-five elected by the "Parti Socialiste Français," four elected by the "Federation des Bouches du Rhone," and three doubtful Socialists (Grousset, Millerand and Calvinhac).

The number of Deputies does not correspond to the real Socialist strength of each department, in view of the alliances which were concluded, if party discipline on the second ballot had been observed by the bourgeois republicans. These, as a matter of fact, appealed to the Socialists to assure their victory over their reactionary competitors, when the Socialists came out in the third



place on the ballot, and in general the Socialists always vote at the second ballot for the bourgeois radical republicans against the pure reactionaries. On the contrary, in many cases, the bourgeois radicals, even when they call themselves "radical Socialists," prefer rather to see a reactionary win than a Socialist, and it is under these conditions that we lost several seats.

Moreover, by reason of the chances of the ballot and the defective system of election by arrondissements, the elections result in surprising inequalities. Thus in the department of the North the "Unité Socialiste Revolutionnaire," which polled 62,261 votes, had but a single Deputy, Delory, elected at Lille, where he has already been Mayor of the city for six years; on the contrary, the "Federation de la Cote d'Or," belonging to the "Parti Socialiste Francais," which polled 11,600 votes, succeeded in electing two Deputies, Bouhey-Alex and Camuzet.

On the whole, the Socialists may regard with confidence the political situation in France and the future reserved for them. In the Parliament, which has just held its first session, in which the groups of the Left have already obtained a complete victory by electing their candidate, the radical Leon Bourgeois, to the presidency, our party will be able to play an important and sometimes even a decisive part. It includes in its ranks some of the most eminent orators and politicians of France. At the side of Vaillant, Marcel Sembat, Rouanet and Poulain, who have been re-elected, come Jaures, de Pressense, A. Briand, Delory and Constant. This will permit our party to assert itself impressively on all important questions of national and international policy.

This parliamentary action is but a part, and not the most important part, of Socialist activity. Something even more important than success at the polls is the progress of Socialist consciousness in the masses, and successes at the polls are in themselves of interest only so far as they permit us to judge of the increase of this Socialist consciousness. Moreover, the development of the economic institutions of the proletariat, the labor unions and co-operatives are also essential. But it is very evident that with the success of the party on the political field, its success on the economic field will be multiplied.


To permit our ideas to pursue their victorious march it is essential in France, as everywhere, that our friends resolutely put aside the grave danger of state socialism. I see by reading the Appeal to Reason that a certain number of our American comrades are also dominated by this deplorable state Utopianism, and that they are confusing public ownership, or "Statization" of certain monopolies with the socialization of all the means of production by the organized proletariat, taking into its hands production and exchange. Our ministerialists are also the dupes of this governmental illusion. I have shown in this article what

harm "ministerialism" has done to French socialism. Only in proportion as all Socialists renounce such dangerous illusions will it be possible for our party to regain its unity. That depends on men like Jaures and on their willingness to have done with the deplorable opportunist tactics, for in spite of all there is no doubt that among all true Socialists there exist plenty of points of contact. Our victorious march depends on our union.

Jean Longuet (translated by Charles H. Kerr).

Paris, June 7, 1902.

## Immediate Demands.

HE Socialists primarily concern themselves with analyzing the capitalist system, pointing out its defects and advocating the replacing of the capitalist system by the collective ownership and democratic administration of the means of production and distribution.

The success of the Socialist movement and the rapidity of its progress will depend very largely upon the method of education and the political tactics of the Socialist party. Mere economic development in itself cannot bring the co-operative commonwealth.

In demanding measures for immediate improvement from the dominant capitalist parties, we in no way submerge the Socialist movement, nor do we waver from the belief in a class conflict. Immediate demands are perfectly consistent with the recognized fact that the capitalist class is in full control of the political state and uses its influence and power, including police, courts and militia to maintain its position of advantage and the permanency of its class.

The capitalist system, however, is not a consistent, methodical and perfectly regulated device. It is filled with contradictions, and the economic contradictions of capitalism, Socialists recognize very well and frequently comment thereon, and we find examples in the tendency of capitalism to obliterate competition on one hand, and the endeavor theoretically and practically to maintain competition on the other, such as the trusts, which negative competition, and against this condition pass laws which make it a penalty to form an agreement in restraint of trade.

The political program of the Socialists is essentially constructive. It must deal with the capitalist system as it is, and take advantage of every possible opportunity to assist in the transition from the private to the public ownership of capital. There is no place in the political movement for the midnight revolution, and cataclysmic transformation.

Among the many contradictory phrases in the political and the economic life of capitalism, there will many be found which have a tendency to strengthen and benefit the working class without giving any corresponding advantage to the capitalist class. All measures which have a tendency to raise the standard of life of the working class through shorter hours, superior educational facilities and opportunities, through higher wages and a better opportunity to organize trade unions, help and assist the Socialist movement because it strengthens those who are taking part therein and compose the bulk of its membership.



The so-called revolutionary Socialists of Chicago went so far (some of them) as to oppose a general referendum on the proposition as to whether the citizens of Chicago should have the privilege of voting on the three questions, to-wit: Municipalizing electric lights, gas and street railways, and when submitted to a vote, some voted against it.

The difference between those believing that we should advocate immediate measures together with our ultimate aim, and those opposed to everything except our ultimate aim, can be illustrated by their points of disagreement in regard to trade unions. The latter, or "clear cuts," advocated trade unions because it is a class movement and educational. Its economic value he deprecates because it "makes pets" and favorites of some workingmen, believing that to raise the life standard of workingmen breeds contentment and thereby retards the "revolution." The former, or so-called "opportunists," believes in the trade union movement not only because of its class character and educational value, but because as an economic weapon it maintains for the workingmen a higher standard of existence than that which they would enjoy if they were completely disorganized.

Socialism does not advance necessarily in response to or because of great industrial distress. These crises may point out the fact that something is wrong, but the suggestion of the remedy and the cure for these ills is quite a different problem. Socialism has made more advance in the last two years in Chicago, than it did in the year 1893, when the stone floor of the City Hall was covered with the restless, homeless, discontented men and thousands of unemployed paraded the streets. Of course, it is true that the very best paid workingmen may be a little slow in picking up Socialism, which is due to the fact that their condition economically is superior to the other workmen in different lines, for by comparison they have nothing to complain about; but all this is no reason why we should oppose or ignore municipal ownership and municipal coal and wood yards and ice houses, etc., which would benefit the people to at least some extent, and the working class more than any others, because there are more workingmen than parasites.

In our recent convention, one "Revolutionist" was applauded when he announced his opposition to municipal ownership because it would improve the condition of the workingmen in those industries. He wanted to improve the condition of all workingmen altogether and simultaneously; the improvement of a part of them at a time to him was to make the favored "pets." I mention this not to reply, that would be stultifying, but because a majority of the convention supported his position, just as though the working class was on an elevator and by pulling the "clear

cut, uncompromising rope," they could all go up evenly together.

One objection to demands made is that capitalists would not operate public utilities as well nor from the same standpoint as Socialists. This contains but a partial truth. Where a city has one or two industries which do not contribute to the health and welfare of its citizens through political corruption and private contracts, such enterprises may be manipulated in the interest of private contractors, etc.

The more important and far-reaching the industries operated by the people, whether a water works or a fire department, the greater will be the interest manifested by the people in public affairs, and the better service will be rendered to the public. And furthermore, every assumption by the state in industries has a tendency to turn the mind of the people from the operating of industries to serve private ends to the operating of industries to serve the public good. The motive of the two enterprises is entirely different. The former is capitalistic, the latter Socialist. The former to make money, the latter for utility, and the more extensive municipal or state ownership becomes the greater social consciousness springs up from the people. It is suggested that the Democratic and Republican party will grant and make these concessions which form a part of the Socialist program. That should not make it any less our duty to demand them and agitate for them. If we are to abandon our objects because a capitalist party prints in its platform, and declares for identically the same thing, then our existence as a political factor is precarious indeed, and it would be equally illogical to take the position opposing a public measure for the reason that capitalists favor it. Upon that theory, we would discharge the fire department and cashier the health officers, and abandon the life-saving service.

It is again urged that demands may be well enough, but they would result in emphasizing palliatives, rather than the fundamental principles of the party. I do not think that emphasis possible to the extent of endangering the party. At the recent municipal elections at Erie, Pa., and Milwaukee, Wis., both of which had progressive programs, there was a range of debate and agitation from the most inconsequential palliative to the entire abolition of the wage system, and in both campaigns it was noticeable that while they opened with discussions of minor points it soon shifted to the fundamental differences between capitalism and the Socialists. These two circumstances do not prove the futility of these demands, but emphasize their political value. Again, it is suggested that in Europe, where considerable nationalization exists, the working class is no better off than here. In the first place, in Europe the railroads are used to serve and support an

extensive military regime. The political structure of the United States is quite different from that of European countries, and has no extensive military system to serve. Here there is a certain state autonomy, and in many states comparative municipal autonomy prevails.

The population of Chicago is nearly as large as that of Massachusetts, and greater than the combined population of Vermont, New Hampshire, Connecticut and Rhode Island. The municipal utilities employ thousands, and there is no force in the argument that municipalizing will build or strengthen a political machine. The republican and democratic politicians control far more offices, more positions and employes who are serving as laborers for the street car and gas companies, and over these employes exercise a much greater influence, considering their number, than they do over the actual city employes. These large private corporations in the cities do not hesitate to corrupt the judiciary, to defeat a working man's damage suit, steal a highway, and then prohibit their own employes from organizing into trade unions. Under city ownership these evils would be minimized, and while it might be slight, the benefits at least warrant a ten word demand in a Socialist platform.

To say that we must oppose these reforms until the Socialist party has complete control of the city, state and nation, is to become impractical, and leave no program for a possible elected candidate, and the conceit of it will breed sterility, and make DeLeon the true Messiah.

As a matter of fact, the capitalists are not willing to grant these reforms. A great public sentiment has been aroused and a pressure brought to bear which they realize cannot long be resisted. For franchises they appeal to the courts, resort to bribery, reach the press, and contribute to the pulpit. They give ground reluctantly, and we should take our position against them. For every private enterprise wrung from capitalists and turned over to the public, no matter how imperfect its shape may be, is a weakening of the opposition and reduces the power of their resistance to Socialism.

The Manifesto has demands, the Social Democracy of Germany has demands, the same is true of Great Britain, Belgium and Sweden, and all other European countries, and in those countries they exploit every public question and capitalist contentions to make known the object and purpose of Socialism. Opportunities in this country now are afforded which are simply marvelous, claiming the public attention and not infrequently disturbing the entire industrial system. Strikes, riots, public crimes, child labor, the invasion of the public schools by cutting off their means of support, and a thousand and one different popular means of



securing the attention of the people. There is no ground for the conservative timidity or the fetish worshipping bigotry which has heretofore prevailed in the Socialist parties of this country. Its integrity can be maintained, its service to the people enhanced, and its beneficial effect to the working class increased, by availing ourselves of the opportunities of each succeeding day.

Seymour Stedman.

## Economic Development and Socialist Tactics.

**T**HE economic development of Europe is so far behind that of America that the problem that is being discussed by Ferri and Kautsky has a very different aspect here in the United States, although at first glance one might think that the question of the insertion of immediate demands in our platform was identical.

We do not insert immediate demands in our platform because we think that we will ever get them or think that getting them we will gain any prestige.

Not at all. We American Socialists recognize that while immediate demands are wanted by a large class of the middle class of people, and that to please them it is policy to insert them in our platform, yet we see that the economic revolution has advanced so far in this country that it is practically impossible to conceive of any considerable part of such demands ever being granted without there coming with it the whole Socialist program.

In Europe it is quite different. All the demands that form a part of our program could be granted by any European government, and it would have little or no immediate economic or political effect toward bringing on a social revolution.

The difference between America and Europe on this question is the difference between a dam that is well constructed holding up a small body of water and a dam that is old and ready to break holding back a great flood that is threatening at any moment to rise and sweep over the dam and carry the whole structure away. In such a case as the latter it is obvious that any weakening the strength of the dam will cause the already over-burdened structure to immediately give way.

I do not think it possible for this country to nationalize the railways without precipitating a social revolution. I have gone over this ground for this theory so often for the last twelve years that it is almost superfluous to state my reasons again. Shortly my argument is that in the United States the capitalization of the railways is greater than the capitalization of the manufacturing interests. Hence if we nationalize the railways we would put into the hands of the present railway owners the economic power to expropriate the manufacturing capitalists. This they would be sure to do. Just as sure to do it as would a pike in a carp pond be sure to gobble the carp. The big capitalist lives only for the purpose of eating up smaller capitalists.

Now the expropriation of the manufacturing capitalists by the former railway capitalists would materially create a revolu-

tion right then and there. I do not mean that it would from its economic effect, but from its political and its psychological effect. Then the nationalization of the railways would also carry with it the nationalization of the steel and iron interests, the coal mines, the locomotive works, the car works, and such a lot of collateral and dependent industries that it would mean such a change of ownership that I can see no possibility of looking at nationalization of our railways except as a revolutionary measure.

I dwell upon the nationalization of the railways, as this is the main plank of the middle class people, and of the Fabians.

Practically the only industrial reform, from a national standpoint, that the middle class demand is that of nationalization of the railways. It is true some call for nationalization of the trusts, but the call is not strong.

But to nationalize even the smallest trust would be even a surer cause for a social revolution than would the nationalization of the railways. Or, rather, I had better put it to get the people in the mood to nationalize the first trust would mean that you had gotten them in the mood to nationalize all trusts. The first success would so intoxicate them that they would never stop until they had swallowed the whole trust ocean.

Then again, the only thing that is going to move the people to any action upon domestic affairs is the great unemployed problem that must appear in our next industrial crisis, now ready to appear. This is going to be of such a critical character and of such an intense nature that the nation will be forced to take the most heroic measures to meet the situation. Thousands of smaller capitalists will go down in the crash, and there will be millions of unemployed workingmen. I don't know which will make the most noise, the capitalists over the loss of their money or the workingmen over the loss of their food. Anyway it will be a pretty chorus. The house of Morgan & Co. will probably go under, and that will be the signal of the social revolution. People will know that when the Colossus Morgan falls that then is the end of modern society.

Morgan has been forced by the danger of over-production to finance and organize all the great trusts with which he has been the head and front, and he and his brother bankers are carrying millions upon millions of the stocks of these mighty corporations which they have been unable to unload upon the public. And a very good reason, too. The public have no money to buy. Morgan & Co. have all the means of production in their hands, and where can the public get any money to buy the stocks? However, there are many bankers and capitalists on the outside of the Morgan combinations in times of distress if these people refuse to carry the Morgan stocks, then Morgan must go to the wall.

Viewing the industrial and financial situation in this way, I



have no fears of the proletariat ever being led off by any spurious state socialism in the shape of public ownership, etc. I think we are so impregnable by our economic maturity that nothing can possibly deflect us from going straight into revolutionary socialism the moment we make a move. I would never fear public ownership because of its being carried into effect. Not at all. I do not see how it can be possibly carried into effect without landing us into socialism. I therefore welcome all sentiment in favor of public ownership, as I think it gets men's minds turned in the right direction.

I favor the retention of amelioratory demands in our platform because I feel that we are too far advanced economically for any one of them to be put into effect without really starting the social revolution, and I think that having the demands in our platform attracts a good many half-baked people to us that we might as well have with us as not.

The aim of our party should be to get as many as possible in sympathy with us without surrendering in any way our revolutionary ideal.

In my magazine I give from time to time accounts of the great progress that New Zealand has made in public ownership, and the many benefits that have flowed therefrom. I do not do this because I think or wish the United States to follow in her footsteps. She could not do so. Nor do I mention New Zealand as an example of how we can get into socialism step by step.

New Zealand, however, does to convey to a great many unimaginative people a lesson as to what the state can do in the way of public ownership. There are many people that would never believe that the United States could ever run her railroads unless we had a Vanderbilt to own them. For such people the lesson of New Zealand is valuable.

When I was in England I often spoke of myself as a revolutionary Fabian. Meaning that I thought the Fabians did a great deal of good in directing the attention of the public to the possibilities of public ownership, and that the knowledge they disseminated upon that subject should weaken the objections that many made as to the impossibility of socialism.

I never could understand why it was that the Fabians, with one or two exceptions, were so entirely out with me upon my Marxian revolutionary catastrophic economics, when all the industrial events so bore out such a theory. In fact, their own facts bore against their own theories.

However, I don't know that anyone is in quite my position of looking for a socialist revolution in a short number of years, owing to the completion of the machinery of production being finished and hence causing a great unemployed problem, and yet at the same time holding that it is good politics for the Socialists

to always favor the step at a time program, although knowing such a program is an impossibility.

I admit the inconsistency of such a policy, but we must take men as they are and not as we would have them. This is the manifesto I ran upon in my candidature for the Canadian Parliament last May. My constituency embraced many farmers, and unless I had a "railway" plank I could never have had many farmer voters.

#### TO THE ELECTORS OF WEST ELGIN.

As the nominee of the Socialist party for Parliament, it is incumbent upon me to give an outline of my principles in order that you may determine if I am worthy of your suffrages.

I am in favor of the Co-operative System of Industry as opposed to the Competitive System. As the result of our competitive system the rewards of labor, instead of flowing to those that labor, flow to the idle possessors of wealth. Whatever may have been the virtues of competition in the past, when we were all on a practically substantial equality of wealth, it has become in the present day of millionaires and paupers simply a means of robbing labor for the benefit of those who hold the wealth of the country.

Competition forces us to sell our goods at the price named by our competitor. If we are selling our labor power we must sell it not at the price we know it is actually worth, but at the price our competitor offers HIS labor power for in the open market. And who is "our competitor?" He is the unemployed man who must sell his labor at once or go hungry. There are always plenty of such men about, and competition from such keeps down the price of labor, i. e., wages, to the mere existence point.

No matter how much labor may increase in productivity, the laborer can get no increased price for it, because competition will always force him to sell it at the same price as before.

Just as the laborer is forced to sell his commodity—labor—at the lowest competitive price, so are the merchants, the manufacturers and the farmers also obliged to sell their commodities at the lowest competitive price. The only man who can get a price above cost for his commodity is the man who can protect himself from competition by the shield of monopoly. The workman, by means of his trades union, prevents wages going down to the very lowest notch; and likewise the capitalist, by virtue of the ownership of land or such machinery as cannot well be duplicated, or by aid of a combination, can protect the prices of his goods from falling below cost.

Monopoly is the key to money getting, but monopoly is not open to all.

The trade union is, at best, but a very indifferent protection

against starvation wages, and in slack times is no protection at all against non-employment.

A monopoly for the farmers and the smaller capitalist is out of the question. There are too many of them to make any effective combination. It is easy enough for two or three railroads to combine, but for two or three million farmers to agree to stop growing crops and hold for a common price is manifestly an impossibility. The farmer must sell his goods in competition with the world and face millions of competitors. If he has any advantage in the ownership of exceptionally good land he is lucky if the railroad company does not find it out and put up their rates to a point that will skim off all the profits that are due to such land value. The farmer is really but little, if any, better off than the workingman, inasmuch as he must always sell his product on a competitive market and whatever advantage he should have by virtue of the ownership of his land is usually lost owing to the high price he must pay to the various combinations controlling the railways, and to the manufacturers of agricultural implements, etc., and other goods he must buy.

The Dominion of Canada should own the railways and furnish transportation at cost, payment for the roads being made by bonds, the interest being met by the profits from the freight charges.

The merchants are also suffering from severe competition among themselves, and are now threatened with a new danger in the growth of the huge department stores which are gradually absorbing all the retail trading.

Labor saving machinery operated by steam and electricity has enormously augmented the productivity of labor. The workingman has participated but little in this increased product. Nor have the smaller capitalists and farmers participated to any degree. Nearly the whole of the increase has gone to the monopolists.

The result of our competitive system is that the many produce and the few get. Those that "get" are those that own the great monopolies and the railways.

I would substitute public ownership for private ownership of these great monopolies, to the end that the many might participate in the advantages now enjoyed by the few.

Let the people own the monopolies and let the products of labor be distributed upon the co-operative plan, instead of the competitive plan. We have solved the problem of production; our only problem of to-day is that of distribution.

Canada is the richest country under the sun. She could furnish a living to ten times her present population and still have plenty of room for as many more again. However, notwithstanding Canada's riches, very few of her people are secure against

an old age of poverty nor indeed are they sure of a decent living from month to month.

I would end all such uncertainty. We here in Canada can all have the comforts and luxuries of life in profusion with only three hours a day labor, if we simply reorganize our industrial system on a basis of Socialism or Public Co-operation.

To do this it is necessary for those most interested in having a change, namely, the wage-earners and the farmers, to unite at the ballot box and elect men who are pledged to carry out the Socialist program.


Let Canada lead in this world reform.

H. Gaylord Wilshire.



## The Two Tendencies.

Berlin, February 16, 1902.

EAR COMRADE FERRI: It gives me the greatest pleasure to receive the news that you intend to publish a review, which will certainly be very useful to our cause, and of importance not only for Italy but for international socialism.

Everywhere in our party the same divergence manifests itself: in Germany, France, Italy, Austria, Russia and Belgium. There is not, fundamentally, any antagonism between reform and revolution, for the revolutionists also desire reforms. Neither is it an antagonism between theoretical and practical Socialists, for each are found on both sides. It is therefore ridiculous presumption for some to claim the distinction of "critics of socialism," in opposition to us, who are to be regarded as "bigots of dogmas and phrases, lacking critical judgment."

Instead, the divergence, which exists throughout international socialism, has for its basis the different position of the two tendencies in relation to the middle class.

This is the nucleus of the question which causes all the differences. Is the antagonism between the middle class and the proletariat so great as to prevent the proletariat from allying itself with certain factions of the middle class against other groups of the middle class? Or are there within the middle class enmities greater than the hostility which exists between the middle class and the working class, so that in some circumstances it is possible and even necessary to establish by the alliance of the working class with certain factions of the middle class a great reform party, a new party of such strength and stability as to be able to share in the government?

Is this alliance of the proletariat with parties of the middle class for the purpose of forming a government party, a necessary stage in the march of the proletariat to the conquest of political power?

Or is it an occasional act made possible or even necessary by exceptional contingencies, rather than simply a normal stage of the evolution through which the party in all countries should pass?

This is the question which is the basis of our dissensions. But unfortunately it is not usually stated so precisely; therefore it is obscured by secondary questions which are principally of a theoretical nature. And this is true, especially in countries where there is a deep gulf between the Socialist and the other parties,

excluding presumptively every practical application of the new method; in such cases the antagonism is reduced to small and trivial contentions which cause bitterness instead of obtaining a solution.

On the other hand, the divergence manifests itself with clear and precise outlines only in countries where it can have a practical influence on the life of the party; that is, where there is a government which has good sense enough to recognize the great strength of socialism and enough craft and courage to try to subdue it—by yoking it to the chariot of the government. This was the case in France, where the new tactics have had the opportunity to show of what use they really are. "Ye shall know them by their fruits," says the Bible, and we can judge the new tactics also by their fruits.

In Italy the new tactics have not been put on trial as in France. However, the recent Parliamentary situation has prepared a soil favorable to their development. More than elsewhere, except in France, the divergence within the party finds in Italy the possibility of leaving purely theoretical grounds to assume a concrete form. After the evolution of French socialism, that of Italy will be in the near future very instructive for the international proletariat.

Therefore I consider the new review "Il Socialismo" (Socialism) of great importance and feel honored in defining and elucidating, in its columns, the internal controversies of the party; so much the more, as it is preferable that the discussion should be published in reviews, rather than take up too much space in periodicals devoted to propaganda. It is indeed true that this is possible only in a case where the dissension does not exceed certain limits, a matter which depends on circumstances more than on the good will of persons.

The divergence exists; to be silent about it or to conceal it, is to increase the malady and delay its cure.

But we heartily wish that the present controversy could be ended without disturbing the unity and strong concord of the party. Being caused by a transitory situation, the present antagonism in the party can and ought to pass away. We wish that the Socialist parties of other countries could be saved from the bitter experiences of the ministerialism of the Socialists of France, and that the class struggle could everywhere animate the united forces of the proletariat and thus enable them to resist the disintegrating effects of ministerialism.

May your review co-operate strongly in such a movement! I wish it long life and prosperity! Cordially yours,

Karl Kautsky.

Prof. Ferri gives the following comments:—

Kautsky made the motion relating to the Millerand question which was passed by the International Socialist Congress of 1900 in Paris, and he now reaffirms the existence of two tendencies in the Socialist party. This does not destroy the essential unity of the party, which, under the stress of all circumstances, will always prevail, as we see in anti-ministerialism the concord of all Socialists.

To deny the existence of those two tendencies, however, means to yield to an apprehension or to an illusion. There is the disinterested and very respectable apprehension that the admitting of a divergence of views and judgments will injure the unity of the party and sharpen personal dissensions. The prevailing illusion shows itself when—as the result of discussions—the reformers put wine in their water or the revolutionists put water in their wine, it is not taken into account that the average result—ing from a minor divergence or from an agreement is precisely the effect of these discussions on the two tendencies. While if these discussions were not held, each of the two divisions might easily make mistakes by going to extremes and exaggerating its own tendency.

The recent polemics on the function of the Socialist party in strikes (to which we shall soon give our attention) is an eloquent example of this.

As for our review, we intend to co-operate in the movement as Kautsky desires, not only by means of polemics (in which we will always preserve cordiality of expression in order to resist the temptation of using irritating words, and avoid rancour, which is so much the more bitter among brothers), but especially by practical observations on the life of our party in different countries, and by the calm and objective study of social facts, keeping the socialist ideal constantly in view, without sacrificing it or obscuring it for the sake of small and temporary gains.

(From Prof. Enrico Ferri's fortnightly review, "Il Socialismo," No. I, February 25.)

Translated by Agnes Wakefield.

## HISTORY OF THE UNITED STATES.

(Concluded.)

### IV. The Climax of Capitalism.

The last epoch to be discussed in our historical sketch coincides approximately with the last decade of the past century. During this period we see events of paramount significance stepping on one another's heels, so to say. Only two of these, however, are of a purely economic nature and exert their influence to the extent of attracting public attention in the beginning of the nineties.

The first and most important of these factors owes its existence to a fact, unknown before 1894, which may be expressed in this general way: The supply of free land is now exhausted. To state it more accurately, only an insignificant remnant of such government land as may be cultivated without the help of gigantic irrigation works is still available. But the farmer class as a whole does not favor irrigation, because the resulting extension of the area of cultivation would cause a falling of the grain prices. With the exception of the already considerably reduced Indian reservations, only arid desert land is now obtainable for a song. The social safety valve, which such men as Edward Atkinson, Professor Sumner and other economist lackeys of the bourgeoisie hoped would save this country forever from a revolutionary explosion, is now closed, and the foundation removed for the well-known contention of the ex-rebel of 1848, Carl Schurz: "There are many social questions in America, but there is no social question."

About this time the Statistical Bureau of the Department of Agriculture reports that practically one-third of the 63,000,000 acres of farm land in the North Atlantic States, from Maine to Pennsylvania, is lying fallow, although located in close proximity to the best markets and lines of transportation, and that the formerly cultivated, but now abandoned, farm land in all the Atlantic States, from Maine to Florida, covers not less than 58 out of a total of about 100 million acres. The deserted farms, many of them with well-preserved houses and barns, speak a mute and yet eloquent language. They are especially numerous in the northeastern part of New York and in the New England States. Their former owners had moved west, in order to exhaust the virgin soil by superficial cultivation, since the eastern soil would not yield any more without intensive cultivation, such as liberal application of fertilizers, etc. But now the land west of the Mississippi, which is accessible without the outlay of capital, is also



exhausted. Horace Greeley's ideological palliative, "Go West, young man," is played out.

The second of the economic factors now exerting its influence is a techno-chemical invention. It was, and still is, of vital importance to the cotton industry of the South, and to the production of cotton goods in the North and other places, being in the nature of a supplement to the invention of the cotton gin. We speak of the invention and application of the process for the commercial exploitation of cotton seed, its utilization for the production of such valuable by-products as oil of different qualities (the finer grades used as salad oil), cake, meal, hulls and linters, with but two per cent of waste. In chapter I. of this sketch we saw that the seeds of the cotton plant drove the planter almost to distraction, because they adhered to the fiber and were very difficult to remove, until the cotton gin came along and removed the difficulty. And now—what a wonderful change in the development of the facts and their irresistible consequences—this once accursed cotton seed becomes a new source of profit. In the year 1899-1900, the planters received the average sum of \$11.55 per ton of cotton seed delivered to the oil mills, yielding them a surplus of \$28,632,616 for a total of 2,479,386 tons. Through the process of manufacturing these seeds acquired a total value of \$42,411,835. Considering that only 53.1 per cent of the cotton seed were delivered to the mills, we find that the potential and attainable value of this seed and its products could have been double the aforesaid amount. The cost of cotton production was correspondingly lowered by the surplus yield of the by-products, and it was, perhaps, this fact which made the demand of the southern ruling class for a cheapening of oversea transportation by means of a back freight less urgent and passionate.

The last named economic factor reacted on the political development of a large portion of the southern population, for now the interests of the small planters were very similar to those of the northern wheat growers. Both, planters and wheat growers, have no interest in a protective tariff, and very little in free trade. But the leaden weight of overproduction is crushing both of them, depressing the price of their products, sometimes below the level of the cost of production. On the wheat and corn fields of the North the balance is then always restored by a restriction of the area of cultivation. But in the South the area cultivated by the small farmer is already so minimal that no further restriction is possible. The outcome of the Civil War had driven most of the southern cotton barons into bankruptcy, and led to a parceling of their large estates into small farms. The majority of these southern small farmers have since been reduced from the position of independent owners to that of renters. The same process takes place in the North. In both cases the low level of

the prices, and nothing but that, uses the mortgage as the lever by which the farm owner is transformed into a farm renter. The great increase in the number of rented farms was one of the most important facts of the preceding decade, and it has steadily continued its course during the last ten years. This state of things is concealed by the statistics, as long as the farm owners are not classified separately from the farm renters. The concentration becomes only slightly manifest from the number of small farms, but all the more from the figures of the property relations.

We see, then, that the first of the two economic factors mentioned obstructs the tide of the westward emigration of proletarian and penurious workingmen and turns it backward by limiting and finally removing all prospects of successful colonization, while the second intensifies the precarious condition of the small farmers in the North and South and thus makes the agrarian question in this country more acute.

Apart from the above named factors, this period does not produce any new forces on the field of economic history, but all the factors created by former periods now work with a greatly intensified power. Capitalism is moving with giant strides and rushing forward and upward to the climax of its career. Our manufacturing industry and its enormously developed productive capacity have now reached the point where America's share in the proceeds of the world market does no longer yield a sufficient rate of interest on the investment. The fatherland of the American capitalist, that is, the market for his products, must become greater. That is the logic of capitalist patriotism, and its current expression is "expansion." And that is what our most prominent patriots are now yearning to obtain. But there is no longer any outlet for American products in the countries immediately adjoining the United States in the North and South. Canada and Mexico offer no more economic opportunities and the external political constellations do not vouchsafe a war of conquest in those directions. Those two countries, like almost all other countries on the American continent, are themselves advanced in the capitalist development, and the conquest of their markets would be a game not worth the candle. Nothing is left, therefore, but the acquisition, that is, the conquest by force of arms, of islands that shall serve as colonies and remain so. Colonial expansion becomes a fact, resumption of the primitive method of capitalist accumulation, with all its concomitant atrocities on the part of the Christian representatives of "American civilization." The traditions of the fathers of the republic, the Declaration of Independence, and all the venerable principles with which a regular cult had been driven only a short while ago, all this is now considered as youthful aberration by our ruling class and its politicians, and thrown into the plunder room. Militarism on

the water is already established, militarism ashore is coming, and our profit mongers are now preparing for new adventures on the highway of world politics.

Under such impulses as these our government, dancing in obedience to strings pulled by a clique of great capitalists, precipitated the war with Spain. Not only was that war most frivolously and criminally provoked, under the cloak of the lying pretense of "setting Cuba free," but a flagrant fraud was also committed against Congress and the people of the United States by suppressing the official declaration of Spain, the publication of which would doubtless have averted the war. For this dastardly act the name of the arch-hypocrite McKinley, on whom the assault of an idiot bestowed the halo of a saint, will be nailed to the pillory of coming centuries. The outcome of this war was nothing but the "relieving" impulse for the transformation of American capitalism into its highest and last form, Imperialism. It cannot turn back any more, and a chasm is yawning in front of it.

Here ends our investigation of American history, from the year of the Declaration of Independence and the beginning of the American Revolution down to these days, when that famous proclamation of the Fathers of the Republic was suppressed by American authorities in the Philippine Islands. A fugitive glance shows us that the Washington government is still busy crushing the resistance of the Filipino fighters for independence, in close imitation of the London government, which is attempting to subdue the independent Boers in South Africa.

From 1776 to 1900-02 is a century and a quarter. How short, how remarkably short is this term when compared to the five centuries which capitalism required for its development in England and in all other European countries, without reaching the same climax as in America. "Pride leads to downfall," says a German proverb. Being prouder than any other, should not American capitalism meet its doom first of all?

### **Coming Party Politics.**

In the preceding chapter we have alluded to one of the political results of the economic history of the United States, the world-stirring war with Spain. That all other important political events of this period can also be traced to economic causes, will hardly require a detailed explanation after all we have said in this historic sketch. These events are still too fresh in our memories, and their economic foundation is too clearly apparent. By the way, the social development of our time renders the phenomena and conditions resulting from it more and more transparent, and thus it becomes even easier for all men of average intelligence to understand the working of its "underground" machinery, so to say, and to recognize its material and economic forces.

The victories of the great capitalist republican party in the elections of 1896 and 1900 are a case in point. The years of the crisis of 1893-95 were a time of severe suffering for our proletariat, and the disaster was put down to the account of the silver humbug of the democratic politician, not without some reason. Of course, the lack of class consciousness, and the general political immaturity, of the American workingmen, was still considerable enough in 1896 and 1900 to make a great mass of them prone to vote for Wm. J. Bryan and a reduction of the exchange value of their wages, out of regard for their "farming brethren." But the capitalists used all their political influence to march their "hands" as voting cattle to the ballot box. Whenever voters succumb to such a political intimidation, it may be easily explained by their economic dependence. Marx has already said in the constitution of the International Workingmen's Association that "the economic dependence of the workingman on the monopoly of the tools of production and means of existence is the basis of servitude in every form, of social misery, intellectual degradation, and political dependence."

And what happened to the specifically agrarian party, the "People's Party?" It disappeared entirely from the scene. A few years of prosperity were sufficient to withdraw the ground from under its feet.

The question of a protective tariff, or free trade, or an approach to the latter, still plays an important part in the history of this country and has its source directly in the conflict of material interests which leads to political divergence. The time when our industrials will feel the protective tariff as an impediment to further development in production and especially as an obstacle to export is not yet in sight. Its coming is delayed in the United States by the fact that this country produces its own surplus of cheap foodstuffs for export, and that at the same time the cost of labor is cheaper here than anywhere else on account of the incomparably more advanced technical development. Moreover, the raw products and accessories needed in manufacture are for the greater part obtained either in our own country or recently in our colonial "possessions." One might be induced to say that the existence of the republican party is safeguarded by these conditions as long as capitalism itself, of which it is the typical political representative, will last.

Not so the democratic party. It will no longer have any stable ground under its feet, no longer any material fundament, as soon as it will drop the "silver issue," which it will probably do soon, and when it can no longer use the "tariff issue" as a pretext, which will become a fact at no remote date. The latter issue will fall so much sooner, as the South is now in process of industrial development. We have already pointed out the ex-



plotation of the by-products of cotton as one of the factors in this new phase. A still more effective reason is the increase of cotton spinning and weaving in the South, which will promptly change the traditional hankering of the Southerners for free trade into the opposite. And the democratic party stands and falls with the great political phalanx, which it had so long in its "solid South." Therefore it must fall, and will begin to show signs of disintegration in the near future.

The consolidation of the two capitalist parties into one will become a fact, sooner or later. And if anything is able to give rise to a strong political labor movement, it will be such a combination of the parasitic classes. A unified political organization of the exploiting classes will necessitate a uniform political organization of the working class, and this will be the Socialist party. And when those ten thousands of exploiters are confronted by the political class consciousness of the millions of workers, then the battle will be won. A beginning, however small, of the political organization of the working class has already been made. As such we may regard the total Socialist vote polled in 1900: 128,000 (S. L. P. 33,450, and 94,552 for the S. D. P., which had then only been organized for two years). At last the economic development begins to hammer a little class consciousness into the thick skulls of the American workmen and opens their understanding for the significance of such drastic and bloody experiences as those of Homestead, Idaho, the railway strike of 1894, Hazleton, of the despotic injunctions issued by the judicial lackeys of capitalism, and of their nihilism concerning any effective labor legislation.

\* \* \*

My work is done. It may be marred by some shortcomings, it may lack completeness, but it should be regarded simply as a sketch. Physical suffering, which the writer was undergoing during his task, may also have affected the literary form. It may also serve as a further excuse that the writer did not find his subject ready at hand and prepared by others. He had not only to describe, but also to venture as an explorer into still very unknown, though much discussed, fields. As a purely theoretical subject, the materialist conception of history, originated by Karl Marx, and further developed by Engels, Kautsky and others, has certainly been discussed considerably, but only a few fragmentary attempts have been made at a practical application of this conception to the history of a given nation or country. To my knowledge, no one has hitherto approached the history of the United States from this standpoint. I had to point out the material connection between economics and politics in American history, and to solve this question within a limited space instead of writing a big volume. How far I have succeeded must be left to others

to decide. If this article will stimulate more capable and efficient talents to take up the subject and improve on my first attempt, I have not worked in vain.

J. L. Franz.

---

### The War of Secession.

---

BY ERNEST CROSBY, AUTHOR OF "CAPTAIN JINKS, HERO."

---



S I look back at the indelible bloody splash upon our history,—the four years' revel of hatred,—the crowded shambles of foiled Secession,—

I see that it was all a pitiable error.

That which we fought for,—the Union of haters by force,—was a wrong, misleading cause,—the warship of bigness,—the measure of greatness by size.

A single town true enough to abhor slaughter as well as slavery would have been better worth dying for than all that tempestuous domain.

From the seed then sown behold imperialism and militarism arise and a whole forest of stout, deep-rooted ills in whose shade we lead an unhealthy, stunted life to-day.

The incidental, unintended good,—the freedom of the slaves,—illusory, unsubstantial freedom at best,—freedom by law but not from the heart,—surely even this is but a doubtful balance in the scales.

Is the good that springs from evil ever a real good?

# EDITORIAL

## Socialism and the Trade Union Movement.

We have often pointed out, not only in these columns, but elsewhere, that the real revolutionary movement in America is to be found west of the Mississippi River. The social rebels who have been created in the East have been driven from their birth-place and are now to be found where the frontier was last located.

To be sure, economic conditions are ever producing new rebellion in the East, and now that the western avenue of escape from those conditions is closed, we may expect to see a rapid growth of intelligent organized discontent in the East. But until sufficient time shall have elapsed to produce a new race of social rebels the storm-center of discontent will be where the economic outcasts, the black-listed, the competition-crushed members of society are now located and that is in the West. Hence it is that the recent great movements in the western trade-unions do not come as a surprise to us.

The importance of the step taken at the Denver convention does not lie alone, or perhaps even chiefly in the fact that the delegates of 120,000 laborers pledged their allegiance to Socialism. Such a declaration was but the most prominent and sensational among a host of signs that indicate the passing of the old and the coming of the new trade-unionism. The increasing number of Socialist articles in trade-union papers, the many instances of abortive "labor parties," the growth of "industrialism" in the unions, the election of prominent Socialists like Max Hayes to important trade-union positions, the readiness with which Socialist speakers are admitted to unions, and most important of all, the now numerous instances where large labor bodies support local Socialist tickets and participate in Socialist conventions—all these are signs that economic development and Socialist propaganda are beginning to teach the organized workers the lesson of a solidarity that does not dissolve into chaotic conflict at the most important point along the whole battle-line—the ballot-box.

The declaration of this great body of organized workers for independent political action will send a thrill of joy and encouragement through every worker for Socialism, and it will also send a shiver of apprehension, not to say terror, up and down the backs of those trade-union officials who are cringing and crawling before capitalist bodies and capitalist politicians, begging for one more chance to sell themselves and their class into industrial slavery.

But while we recognize the great good that was done at Denver, we

cannot but wish that the better thing that was within their grasp had been accomplished.

When the delegates declared for Socialism, when they renounced allegiance to the old political parties, and set their faces toward the co-operative commonwealth, they were marching grandly forward. But when they decided to divide the forces of labor upon the industrial field, to establish rival unions, to set workmen against each other in the face of the employer, they were moving backwards.

It is true there was much provocation. It has been shown that while Gompers was writing articles in the *American Federationist* breathing the spirit of brotherly love, and was sending delegates ostensibly to secure harmony between the Western Labor Union and the American Federation of Labor, he was also sending out private letters in large quantities, most bitterly attacking that organization with its leaders. There may even be reason to believe that he was playing this apparently two-faced game with the expectation and intention of being found out, and hoped thereby to keep the two organizations apart. The entrance of a powerful, intelligently class-conscious body of workers such as make up the membership of the W. L. U. into the A. F. of L. might easily lead to a break-up of the continuous flirtation of Gompers with Hanna, Cleveland, Morgan & Co.

After granting all this the truth still remains that the place to fight these tendencies is inside and not outside the A. F. of L. This whole position has been so thoroughly fought out and so completely settled, both in theoretical discussion and in practical experience that we cannot but express our surprise at the eagerness with which many Socialists have welcomed this new movement.

When the Western Labor Union changed its name to the American Labor Union and declared its intention of invading the East to fight the American Federation of Labor, the Socialists who sanctioned that movement were helping to inaugurate another S. T. & L. A. It alters the case but little that the A. L. U. is a genuine labor union and not a mere paper appendix to a defunct political party. The principle remains the same.

The excuse may also be offered that initiative in the formation of the A. L. U. came from the industrial field and that therefore since the two unions came into existence independent of the Socialist Party the Socialists could do no less than show their sympathy with the union which adopted their principles.

But when all this sophistry is brushed aside we see at bottom the hard, indisputable fact that at a time when trade lines, race divisions, and national boundaries are all being wiped out in the internationalization of labor, we are about to see a fratricidal strife among the organized workers of America.

No one at all conversant with trade-union history or present conditions will be at all deceived by the statement that the A. L. U. proposes to work among the great body of unorganized who are eager for organization. Every new trade-union movement says the same thing. But the fact is that there is no such body clamoring for organization. The truth is that at the present moment, so far from expending all its energies in organizing new unions, the A. L. U. is seeking to secure the allegiance of old unions who are dissatisfied in any way with the A. F. of L. poli-



cies. These tactics can have but one result: Rival unions in the same field "scabbing" on each other while capitalists grow fat.

The more reactionary of the A. F. of L. officials are welcoming the fight. They know, if the founders of the A. L. U. do not, that an enemy is much less dangerous outside than inside their organization, and they see in the progressive tendencies of the A. L. U. their most deadly enemy. Already these leaders have forced the fight upon the brewery workers, and are demanding that those branches which are affiliated with the A. L. U. renounce their allegiance to that body. The brewery workers are strongly impregnated with Socialism and are antagonistic to the Gompers' ring and hence he would gladly see them outside.

The Gompers-Hanna combination will be quick to see their advantage. They will at once attack the Socialists who seek to work among the membership of the A. F. of L. as "union wreckers" and declare that the A. L. U. is simply the S. T. & L. A. of the Socialist Party. Those Socialists who cast in their lot with the A. L. U. will at once be debarred from further work in the much larger field of the A. F. of L. Can we afford to be put in this position? Is it fair to the many trade-unionists who are working within the old organizations for Socialism?

Of the ultimate result there is little doubt. In one way or another, sooner or later, the trade-union must come to accept the philosophy of Socialism. But because of this certainty of economic and intellectual evolution, we are in no way excused from considering the different roads by which that end may be reached. Indeed, since the goal is certain the method becomes of paramount importance.

The trade-union movement can be converted to Socialism by the gradual conversion of its members under the combined propaganda of economic development and Socialist teachings. When this stage is reached those officers who stand in the way of progress and seek to link proletarian fortunes to the capitalist chariot will be pushed one side in favor of those who more nearly incarnate the social forces of the time.

Had the A. L. U. sent their delegates to the next convention of the A. F. of L. at New Orleans, with instructions to add their efforts to those of Hayes, Barnes, Cowan and the ever-growing body of valiant workers for Socialism who have struggled so long and well within the unions, they would have struck the mightiest blow for Socialism that has fallen in these many years.

Another road, which perhaps leads to the same end, but which is already obstructed by the ill-smelling carcass of the S. T. & L. A. is that of independent Socialist unions. In the end there is a possibility that such a union will succeed in overthrowing the other unions, particularly if the older organizations continue their present reactionary tactics. But that victory will have been gained only at the terrible cost of several years of war between bodies of organized laborers, and the advance will have been made over the wrecks of ruined unions and disheartened workers. During all that time it means decreased power of resistance to exploitation.

Therefore it is that while we rejoice that the western workers have done so good a thing we cannot but believe there was a better thing within their grasp which they let slip, when they refused to add to

their declaration of the solidarity of the working-class in the political field a move toward strengthening their solidarity on the industrial field.

Since, however, this situation has now been forced upon us we must meet it. This break in the ranks of the workers in their industrial fight must be closed up as soon as possible. It is absolutely certain that sooner or later it will be closed up. The evolution of industry will compel union.

Again, the only question for Socialists is, How they can best hasten that union of forces. One thing is certain, and that is that the A. L. U. will never consent to link its fortunes with the A. F. of L. while the leaders of that organization are in such close connection with capitalism. For those Socialists who live in the West, the problem is simple. They now have an added reason for working for the success of organized labor.

For the eastern Socialist the question is a different one. The most effective way in which he can work to end this factional fight and to advance the interests of Socialism at the same time is to work to place the A. F. of L. upon the advanced ground now occupied by the A. L. U. Those who really wish to preserve the A. F. of L. as a fighting organization, who really have its best interests at heart, must bend all their energies toward the abolition of "Gomperism," and the education of their brother unionists in the principles of Socialism, so that the organization as a whole may be brought abreast of economic development.

Every effort should be made to see that the delegates to the convention at New Orleans are instructed to elect such men into the general offices of the A. F. of L. as have some comprehension of the progress of events.

If the A. F. of L. refuses to do this, if it still depends upon lobbying before capitalist parties for favors, if it continues to permit its officials to run for office on Democratic or Republican tickets, or to affiliate with Civic Federation frauds,—if, in short, "Gomperism" and pure and simpledom continues to prevail, then the A. F. of L. is doomed and all the efforts of its friends in its behalf are futile.

The largest and most dangerous band of "union wreckers" in existence to-day, are the gang of men within the unions, who are seeking to bind labor organizations fast to the falling ruins of capitalism. The whole rotten structure of exploitation and greed is tottering to its downfall, and in its fall it will crush whatever still remains within its walls.

---

We have received a letter from Comrade S. S. Hobson, of the I. L. P., England, stating that the report published in *The Review* for May that the I. L. P. issued no financial report is incorrect, as such a statement was issued. We cheerfully give place to this correction and only state in defense that we could find no trace of such a report in the I. L. P. papers which were sent to us, and that the Continental Socialist papers also failed to find it, and remarked its absence.

# SOCIALISM ABROAD

E. Untermann.

## Belgium.

The revolutionary demonstrations and their bloody suppressions are over. The dead are buried, and no one can bring them back to life into the arms of those who loved them. The widows and orphans are facing a future full of anxiety, dreariness and sorrow. The police and soldiers have returned to the more pleasant and less dangerous routine of smoking cigarettes and flirting with the daughters and sisters of the men whom they had faced as deadly foes a few days ago. The ballot has the word for a short moment. What will its verdict be? A great Socialist victory?

Heaven forbid! The hearts of the little bourgeois and penny bondholders, still fluttering under the threats of the rising proletariat, at once sought shelter under the strong wings of the clerical government that had so convincingly demonstrated its power. And away they went, these faint little bourgeois souls, whose eternal blessedness is wrapped up in the paltry little property which they have managed to scrape together in the competitive struggle, and which a stroke of the great capitalist hand may sweep away to-morrow. A vote for capitalism by all means! That was the first and direct effect of the premature talk of violence in Belgium. A victory for the clericals also at the polls!

It was a surprise even for the victors themselves. And yet the psychological motives for such a turn of events in a society so imbued with the idea of property as ours are palpable enough. The elements which might have been won for the cause of Socialism by the work of calm propaganda were frightened off into the capitalist camp by the specter of a revolution with its unknown terrors. And now the work of education must be carried on under added difficulties. That is an education for the educators themselves.

Candidates for Parliament had to be re-elected in 15 old election districts, and 14 new mandates had been created, eight of which belonged to five of these 15 old districts, while six belonged to districts of the other half of the country, which did otherwise not participate in this year's elections. Nearly all of these election districts were clerical strongholds. Out of the total number of votes, the clericals received 1,071,500, the Socialists 476,862, the liberals 499,225, while about 31,000 votes were scattered. Compared with the elections of 1900, the clericals gained 76,444 votes, the Socialists 9,526, and the liberals 1,921. The clericals captured 10 new mandates, the Socialists three, the liberals held their seats in the Chamber but lost two in the Senate, and the

Christian Democrats gained one. The Socialists lost 3,029 votes in the old districts, but gained 12,555 in the six new districts, so that they made a small gain, which, however, appears insignificant beside the enormous increase in the clerical vote.

The Belgian Chamber is now composed of 96 clericals, 34 Socialists, 34 liberals and 2 Christian Democrats. In 1900 the respective figures were 86, 31, 34 and 1. The new Senate contains 62 clericals (formerly 48), 41 liberals (39), and 5 Socialists (5). There will be a clerical majority of 26 in the Chamber and 16 in the Senate, for the next two years.

The clerical power, then, is not yet on the wane. It is still in its rising quadrant, and does not seem to have reached its meridian yet. In 1846, there were 12,000 members of religious orders in the country, in 1900 their number had increased to 31,000 indigenous and 6,000 foreign members. The number of religious settlements in 1846 was 779, but in 1900 this had grown to 1,709. Among 15,828 public school teachers in 1900, 4,240, over one-quarter, were clergymen. This social organization is complemented by an equivalent political organization. Religion, school and politics, with a solid property foundation, that is the happy mixture of matter and mind by which the church will flourish as long as the economic fundament will hold.

The miners are also reminded that politics and economics are inseparable brothers. Hardly are the elections over, when we hear that wages in the Borinage coal district have been reduced 12 per cent. And yet, the bosses sympathized with their employes during the general strike! The times were dull, there was a surplus of coal, and the general strike meant a restriction of the output and a saving of wages. Who would not sympathize under such circumstances? But now, ah, that is different!

There is no use in trying to find excuses for the outcome of the demonstrations and the elections. There is even less in criticising the tactics of the Belgian comrades after the event, or in speculating on the future of the movement for universal suffrage. This movement will win as surely as the progress of economic evolution will draw the bottom from under the feet of the clericals and bear intelligence into the brains of the Belgian workingmen. If the Belgian Socialists were too sanguine in their expectations, if they made mistakes that lead to a useless sacrifice of human lives—all this is human, and we feel sure that our comrades will know how to do better in the future.

---

### France.

---

A recent number of the Guesdist organ, "Le Socialiste," publishes a list of the Socialist representatives in the Chambre des Deputes, which we reproduce for future reference:

Unite Socialiste Revolutionnaire:

Nine Blanquists—Allard, Bouveri, Chauviere, Contant, Dejeante, Sembat, Thivrier, Vaillant, Walter.

Four Guesdists—Constant, Delory, Dufour, Baron.

Two affiliated Socialists—Benezech, Selie.

Parti Socialiste Francais:

Thirty-two representatives—Aldy, Bagnol, Basly, Boyer, Bouhey-



Alex, Breton, Briand, Camuzet, Cardet, Carnaud, Cadenat, Calvinhac, Charpentier, Colliard, Clovis Hugues, Deveze, Ferrero, Fournier, Gerault-Richard, Jaures, Krauss, Labussiere, Lassalle, Meslier, Millerand, Paschal-Grousset, Pastre, Poulaj Piger, de Pressense, Rouanet, Veber.

La Petite Republique mentions the deputy, Vigne, as the 48th Socialist, but it seems that he is somewhat doubtful, as his name appears also on the list of the radicals.

Immediately after the elections, the Ministry Waldeck-Rousseau resigned. The motives given by the Prime Minister are bad health and the conviction that the Republic is no longer in danger of a royalist reaction, as proven by the vote of the country. The radicals are for a while the ruling element. Not only has the radical Bourgeois been elected President of the Chamber of Deputies, but the new Cabinet is also made up principally of radicals. The new Prime Minister, Combes, is a former radical Senator and the most important portefeuilles are in the hands of the same political party.

It is remarkable, that the new Minister of Finance, Rouvier, is the same man who was compromised in the Panama scandal. The radicals had nobody with banking talents in their own ranks, and so they selected a liberal. The Bourse was so fully alive to the financial ability of the new Minister that the quotations on government bonds rose several points as soon as his acceptance became a fact.

The program of the new Cabinet is everything but radical. Abolition of the law favoring the religious orders and the employment of clergy-men in public schools, enforcement of the law against the congregations, reform of military service in favor of a two years' term, and "study" of the question of state control of railroads. The demand for a progressive income tax had to be modified into "tax reform," as Rouvier would not accept the Ministry of Finance on any other condition.

On the eve of the opening of the new Chamber, the "interfederal committee" of the Parti Socialiste Francais celebrated their "success" in the elections with a great banquet. Speeches were made outlining the future policy of the party in the Chamber, which will be to support the Cabinet, providing it adheres to its "radical" program. Millerand has resigned and there is to be no more "individual participation in the government." It will be the aim of the party to control the opposition side of the House. Frequent allusions were made to the "numerical and tactical superiority" of the P. S. F. over the Unite Socialiste Revolutionnaire, and the usual playing with the word "revolution" was in order. The "revolutionary utopianism" of the Marxians was severely criticised and found its noble counterpart in Jaures' "evolutionary utopianism," which will consist in the introduction of "bills for the transformation of great parts of capitalist property into collective property, the reduction of the army and navy, etc.," all of which things he is going to do by the help of the capitalist government in the age of colonial expansion. The speakers were, of course, all in favor of "Unite Socialiste," and the way to bring it about was, according to them, the absorption of the "insignificant" remainder of the U. S. R. We will wait a while, till we hear another song.

The Guesdists have been rather unfortunate lately, no doubt. Not

only was Guesde defeated in the elections, but "Le Petit Sou," the daily of the U. S. R., was also forced to suspend publication. It had been founded by the rich Alfred Edwards, who spent 700,000 francs in trying to put it on a paying basis. Such temporary setbacks do not discourage those who are determined to win, and know that the under dog is bound to have its day.

---

### **New Zealand.**

---

A recent report from New Zealand to the London "Clarion" states that the formation of a strong farmers' party has caused the government to neglect the trade unions. A late decision of the Supreme Court forbids the favoring of trade unionists for members of boards of arbitration. Municipal reform is being neglected. Premier Seddon is traveling in Europe and making imperialist speeches. Transportation, gas, water, public market halls are in the hands of monopolists. Well, well! Does that read like a report from the workingmen's paradise? The Socialist party is also growing, Tom Mann being organizer. What is there to organize? Haven't we been told that everybody is happy? Or can it be possible that New Zealand was not on the road to Socialism for a while yet, but simply on the road to Capitalism, and that some of our enthusiastic friends were a little off in their economics?

# THE WORLD OF LABOR

By Max S. Hayes.

A crisis in the great strike of the anthracite coal miners is rapidly approaching. Probably before this magazine reaches its readers the Indianapolis convention will have been held and cast the die that will determine whether or not a national suspension is to be ordered that will bring the total number of strikers up to 300,000. Every effort to arbitrate and compromise the strike has been spurned by the coal barons, who are determined to destroy the mine workers' organization. Every desertion of weak-kneed men here and there has been joyously heralded broadcast by a subservient press. Every insignificant rumpus between union men and scabs and imported thugs has been duly magnified and led to emphatic demands "that violence must cease," "law and order must be maintained" and "anarchy must be kept down." On top of the autocratic demands of the magnates that the men return to work as individuals, their organs are holding out the threat that only about one-third of the anthracite miners will be re-employed, as the smaller mines will remain closed and many economies will be introduced that will dispense with the need of fully 50,000 workers. The fears of the public are also being aroused by the cry of a "coal famine," which is being raised to prevent funds from being contributed to the miners, to create enmity toward the strikers and to cause dissension among the men. However, the miners are making a gallant fight against all odds.

J. W. Slayton, of the carpenters, has been elected to the City Council in New Castle, Pa., and W. J. Croke, of the flint-glass workers, secured a seat in the Marion (Ind.) Council. Both were delegates to the last A. F. of L. convention and are tireless advocates of Socialism. The Socialists at Linton, Ind., also elected a City Councilman, and in municipal elections in Indiana, New York and other States, lately, the same large gains that have been made by the Socialist party during the past eighteen months, are reported. The vote seems to double and treble—in the Oregon State election, judging from scattering returns, the vote appears to have multiplied four-fold. From everywhere come the most glowing accounts of the increase in Socialist sentiment, and just now great activity is being manifested in nominating State and local tickets and clearing the decks for the fall campaign. The national committee is doing much good work and has a number of able speakers and organizers in the field, but is handicapped for want of funds. An appeal has been sent out by Secretary Greenbaum, pointing out the great good that can be done just at this time if more donations can be secured, and it will probably be heeded and the efficiency of the national body will

be increased. While the strength of the Socialist party is rapidly increasing, workmen in scores of cities are catching the fever of "labor mayor" victories and advocating independent political action. This new phenomenon should not alarm members of the Socialist party, for the reason that it is an encouraging sign that the working class is escaping from the chains of old-party slavery, and is a sort of halting place in the transition from capitalism to Socialism. The "labor mayor" movement is purely local and will never become national in scope, and if met fairly and tolerantly by Socialists can be gradually brought into the right channel. In the meantime the pure, undecayed, fakirless, skateless and crookless Socialist Labor party is in a state of total dissolution, as about the 37th internal fight is on. A former member of the national committee has sued to recover a loan of \$1,650, another has sued for wages, still another has issued a circular exposing the fraudulent manner in which certain prominents have conducted affairs, while yet another seems to be organizing the disgruntled ones to make war on the few still in control. As a fitting climax the boss has taken a three months' "vacation"—probably to avoid the crash. And a simple-minded member, who bids fair to become an historical character, wrote to inquire of the S. L. P. committee whether "all the rascals are not kicked out yet!" The political horizon seems to be clearing fast enough.

Bros. Morgan and Rockefeller have not been very busy lately, both having been on a vacation. The former visited Europe while the latter has put in his time on his preserves in Cleveland. It is reported, however, that while on the other side of the water Morgan has found time between meals to strengthen his ship combine, gobble a few mines and mills in the Netherlands and secure valuable concessions from the Czar of Russia and other crowned heads, as well as to enlist the Rothschilds in some great financial undertakings that are unknown at present. Rockefeller is said to be investing some of his spare change in such manner as will give him a tighter grip on railroads and iron and steel production, while he also picked up the bicycle trust on the side at a bargain and is reported to be after large automobile interests. Probably these geniuses will startle the dear people in the near future with some gigantic deal, little short of foreclosing their mortgage on the earth.

The A. F. of L. officials are greatly disappointed at the action of Congress in passing the new Chinese exclusion law, which was a compromise or makeshift, and turning down the bill endorsed and advocated by the Federation. President Gompers refers to the new measure as the "Chinese Bunco Bill" in a bitter editorial, and concludes that the law "presents one of the most conspicuous pieces of bungling or vicious legislation, or both, ever enacted by Congress." The cause for all this wrath is found in the fact that the new law permits Chinese coolies to swarm into the country in hordes by way of Mexico and British possessions, and also via the Philippines, as "sailors." Then, again, the Chinese treaty will probably be abrogated in 1904, when the doors will undoubtedly be opened widely. The Federation officials are also resentful because of the manner in which the politicians in Congress are playing ping-pong with the other labor bills. Thus the eight-hour bill went



through the House and was smothered in committee in the Senate, and the bill to create a department of labor and commerce was adopted with a whirl in the Senate and in the House Committee all reference to "labor" was stricken out. Again, the anti-injunction bill was vociferously adopted in the House and when it came before the Senate it was so ridiculously amended that it actually legalized and fostered the injunction curse. The prison labor bill and the seamen's bills were also buried in committee and it is doubtful whether they will ever be resurrected. Those who have opposed the policy of the Federation in begging for favors at the hands of the capitalistic politicians, or at least the expenditure of large sums of money to keep a lobbying committee at Washington, are wondering how much longer the farce is to continue. It is argued that if as much money and energy were spent in educating the working people to an understanding of their rights and how to obtain them through independent political action, by electing men from their own ranks to legislative offices, as the workers of Europe and Australia are doing, much more would be gained in the long run. Just what tale of woe will be unfolded by the A. F. of L. President, Executive Board and Legislative Committee at New Orleans we shall perhaps learn later on.

Probably the most widely discussed occurrence in the trade-union movement during the past month was the action taken by the three national unions—the Western Labor Union, the Western Federation of Miners and the Hotel and Restaurant Employees—which met in Denver. All three organizations adopted uncompromising declarations in favor of Socialism. They went even farther and decided to call conventions in the Western States, nominate tickets, circulate literature and carry on an active propaganda among the working people in advocacy of the abolition of the wage system and the inauguration of the co-operative commonwealth. Much of the credit for the change in the policies of these organizations is due Eugene V. Debs and Father Hagerty, a Catholic priest, who has given up his pulpit to take the stump for the Socialist party, both of whom were guests of the Denver conventions. Presidents Boyce and McDonald, of the first-named unions, advised the delegates, in submitting their annual reports to take an advanced stand politically and industrially. The recommendations were thoroughly discussed and carried by overwhelming majorities when the vote was taken. The hotel and restaurant workers will take a referendum vote on the proposition, but it is generally admitted that Socialism will prevail. In addition to the Western agitators who will proselyte for the cause of Socialism, Debs, Father Hagerty and W. H. Wise will open headquarters in Denver and carry on an aggressive campaign throughout the Mountain States. During the last few weeks Debs has toured Montana, Washington and British Columbia and received great ovations wherever he went. Besides making a stand for Socialism, the Western Labor Union changed its name to American Labor Union, and, it is reported, will make an active effort to bring working people in the East to its standard. Opinion is divided as to whether or not the A. L. U. will be successful in gaining a strong foothold in the Eastern country, owing to the position occupied by the A. F. of L. The partisans of

the new body, however, argue that there are millions of workers yet to be organized, and, because of the conservatism of the Federation, there is room for a more progressive organization. Some of the extremists in both bodies are predicting war to the knife, but they do not pretend to explain just what is to be accomplished by a course of that kind.

Some important changes have taken place in the official composition of several national unions during the past month. Ed. Lynch, President of the metal polishers and brass workers' organization, has been defeated for re-election, Nick Duttie, of Dayton, having succeeded him. L. R. Thomas, President of the patternmakers, has given place to James Wilson, of Erie. President Lynch has been re-elected in the Typographical Union, as was also Secretary Bramwood, while the A. F. of L. delegation for the next two years will be composed of Wm. Garrett, of Washington; Max. Hayes, of Cleveland, and Frank Morrison, of Chicago, who is the present Secretary of the Federation. President Higgins has been re-elected by the printing pressmen, and John Mulholland, of the metal mechanics. There are several other contests on in the national bodies. It is rumored that P. J. McGuire will attempt to recover his former position as Secretary of the carpenters. J. W. Slayton will be a candidate for re-election to the A. F. of L. in the same union, and Harry Thomas, of Cleveland, will make a contest for the Federation in the Amalgamated Carpenters, and Isaac Cowen will quite likely do the same thing in the Amalgamated Engineers. John P. Sheridan, of Cleveland, another radical, has been elected delegate to the Federation in the iron and steel workers, who also re-elected President Shaffer. The progressive element everywhere seems to be making an attempt to push to the front in the labor organizations.

## BOOK REVIEWS

"*Chapters in the History of the Arts and Crafts Movement.* By Oscar Lovell Triggs. Published by the Bohemian Guild of the Industrial Art League.

With its uncut deckel edges, broad margins, beautiful type (for a modern type founder's work), this book is a joy to look upon and handle. Nor is one disappointed in the contents, for it is really a valuable contribution to the literature of the new social revolt. The growth of the movement toward the return of art to the workshop and the home of the worker is traced through the writings and lives of Carlyle, Ruskin and Morris, with a review of the present day work of Ashbee, the Rookwood pottery and some of the other efforts now being made to realize the ideals of these thinkers. Carlyle insisted on the essential nobleness of creative work, on the necessity of truthfulness in production, and in the superiority of "doing" rather than saying. "Mistaken in nearly all points relating to political democracy, he was always right in discussing questions of industry, and his dream of some 'chivalry of labor' is even now being realized—the complete democratizing of labor, which Carlyle actually feared, being reserved for a distant future. \* \* \* Carlyle's word fell upon the ear of a young man then idling in Switzerland, and employing an astonishing literary skill in describing objects of nature and art—but presently to become something quite other than a literary dilettante, a something more even than Carlyle; namely, a Socialist in both word and deed. \* \* \*

When Mr. Ruskin came to examine into the subject practically, he found that \* \* \* wider questions were complicated with this of art—nothing short of the fundamental principles of human intercourse and social economy." He saw that "a certain amount of leisure, a certain amount of skill, and a certain amount of intelligence, are requisite for the best work. Given, then, ideal conditions for work, what profits should a man have for his labor? The essential reward lies naturally in the happiness which the work engenders. Labor that is wholesome exercise, involving the skill, and intelligence and character of the individual, is not really labor in the Ruskinian sense, for there is no expense of life. By the recognition of the human values of labor the question of wages is rendered of secondary moment. The real demand of workmen who have not been degraded or corrupted by the mammonism of the day is not for higher wages but for better conditions of labor. The assumption that a man is a repository of energy to be elicited by wages alone is unworthy any observer of men. The wage system is but another form of the chattel slavery it superseded, and wages, high or low, is still a

token of bondage. The distinguishing sign of slavery, Ruskin said, 'is to have a price and to be bought for it.' The best work of poets, artists, and scientists is never paid for, nor can the value of toil in these fields be measured in terms of money." But both Carlyle and Ruskin were antagonistic to democracy and hence incapable of giving rise to a real Socialist movement. "In their moods of doubt both thinkers proclaimed the need of a nation's governance by its superior members—the aristoi by divine sanction, who should be leaders and rulers in a state of natural feudalism." With William Morris, however, the chain of thought was completed. Yet he approached the subject from the literary and constructive side rather than the exclusively political. "In the order of his development poetry preceded and then coincided with his craft, his craft preceded and then coincided with his Socialism. \* \* \* He divides work into three classes: Mechanical, Intelligent and Imaginative. The first kind is done under compulsion, without thought and without any inherent reward. The second kind is work that can be done better or worse, and which if well done claims attention from the workman, and requires the impress of his individuality; it is not too toilsome, and is done with some degree of pleasure. The third kind rises above the second in degree only; it is altogether individual, and is all pleasure—fertile of deeds gainful to mankind. \* \* \* The problem of the world is then to change the lower form of labor into the higher, and in the light of this problem the questions of commerce, machinery, and the division of labor must be considered." The following quotation from a letter written by William Morris in January, 1896, is such an excellent summary of his whole position that it is well worth reproduction: "My view on the point of the relation between art and Socialism is as follows: Society (so-called) at present is organized entirely for the benefit of a privileged class; the working class being only considered in the arrangement as so much machinery. This involves perpetual and enormous waste, and the organization for the production of genuine utilities is only a secondary consideration. This waste lands the whole civilized world in a position of artificial poverty, which again debars men of all classes from satisfying their rational desires. Rich men are in slavery to philistinism, poor men to penury. We can none of us have what we want, except (partially only) by making prodigious sacrifices, which very few men can ever do. Before, therefore, we can so much as hope for any art, we must be free from this artificial poverty. When we are thus free, in my opinion, the natural instincts of mankind toward beauty and incident will take their due place; we shall want art, and since we shall be really wealthy, we shall be able to have what we want." In his comments on the "Rookwood Pottery" of Cincinnati, Prof. Triggs says: "So long as the factory is organized to the end of making profits for some owner and director, an issue of production in art is practically impossible. The wage slavery of the factory forbids art; the machine forbids it; competition forbids it; the methods of designing and executing by division of labor are against it." After having thus clearly set forth that it is the competitive, private-property, profit-seeking element in modern society that is at war with all good, artistic, creative labor, Prof. Triggs still looks for some "man of millions, convinced of the gospel of labor," to make possible the realization of ideal industrial



work-shops. He sees nothing of the great revolt of the workers which is really destined to usher in the conditions for which he longs and is blind to all the great industrial tendencies that are working for the abolition of the conditions of which he complains.

*A Persian Pearl, and Other Essays.* By Clarence S. Darrow. C. L. Ricketts, Chicago. Art cover, uncut edges. 160 pp. \$1.

There are five decidedly remarkable essays in this book, all of them presenting some literary subject in the light of Socialist philosophy. The first on "A Persian Pearl," is an exposition of the pessimistic philosophy of the "Rubiyat of Omar Khayyam." The next two are on Walt Whitman and Robert Burns, respectively, and the fourth is the one with which most Socialists are familiar, entitled "Realism in Literature and Art." The final one, on "The Skeleton in the Closet," is—from a literary point of view—perhaps the most beautiful of the lot. But it is too much of a plea for the blessings of adversity to be in accord with modern philosophy or the other essays in the book. The title page and initials are handsomely illuminated, and the uncut edges, and generally tasteful design does credit to Mr. C. L. Ricketts. The book would make a beautiful present for birthday or other time of remembrance of friends.

*Britain for the British.* By Robert Blatchford. Charles H. Kerr & Company. Cloth, 177 pp., 50c; paper, 25c.

Probably few people outside of the Socialist movement, and not all of those within that movement, are aware that the book that has had the largest sale of any book published in the last fifty years was a Socialist book. "Merrie England," by Robert Blatchford, has had a sale of over 2,000,000 copies and is still selling at a rate that would put many of the popular novels in the shade. On any principle of comparison "Britain for the British" should have an even larger circulation. It is a better book. It is written in the same popular entertaining style. It comes at a time when there is much more of a demand for Socialist literature. The names of a few of the chapters will give an idea of the subject-matter. "What Is Wealth? Where Does it Come From? Who Creates It?" "How the Few Get Rich and Keep the Many Poor," "What Socialism is Not," "What Socialism Is," "The Need for a Labor Party," "Why the Old Parties Will Not Do." For propaganda work among those who know nothing of Socialism, for "setting people thinking," for a "starter," "Britain for the British" is unexcelled. There is a little too much of an inclination toward State Socialism to be wholly in accord with scientific Socialism, and it will need to be followed by more thorough literature. But its reading will make the unconverted eager to know more about Socialism, and there is plenty of literature which will give this higher education. This is a book not so much for the library of the student as the armory of the propagandist.

*Crime and Its Relation to Social Progress.* By Arthur Cleveland Hall. Columbia University Press. Macmillan Co., Agents. Cloth, 427 pp. \$3.50.

The thesis of this book is clearly stated in the preface, as follows: "Careful study of the writings of criminal anthropologists has strengthened the conviction that, in calling attention so forcibly to the physiological and psychological study of individual degeneration as the essen-

tial fact in criminology, we have been drawn away from another side of the truth, perhaps equally important, namely: the evolutionary function and usefulness of crime and punishment. Crime is in large part a social product, increasing with the growth of knowledge, intelligence and social morality, increasing because of this growth. The persistent enlargement of the field of crime is a necessity for all truly progressive nations. Many acts, formerly harmless, or socially beneficial, become harmful as civilization grows higher and more complex. An increase of crime, however, does not mean necessarily an increase of anti-social conduct. In fact, anti-social acts may have diminished while crime has grown larger in amount, or may have increased while crime has decreased. Society's conflict with its criminal members, due to the enforcement of new social prohibitions, is one of the chief means by which humanity, in every age, has risen from a lower to a higher plane of civilization, from almost uncontrolled license, selfishness and hate, into true liberty, love and mutual helpfulness." A vast array of evidence is then marshalled from the fields of biology, ethnology and history, ancient and modern, to substantiate this thesis. Whatever we may think of his conclusions the author has assembled a mass of information which renders his book invaluable to the worker in this field of sociology. But when we come to examine the thesis, over which so much is made, we find that he has simply said in longer words and more complex sentences what hundreds and even thousands of writers have said before him, that punishment is simply society's method of casting out the unfit. What he has never a glimpse of is that the choice of the unfit is always made by a ruling class and may sometimes be wrongly made, and hence tend to retrogression. Although he has collected an elaborate bibliography, he does not seem to have heard of Enrico Ferri's "Criminal Sociology," the most epoch-making work ever published in the realm of criminology, and when he does refer to another of Ferri's works he has forgotten how to spell his name. It never occurs to the author that conditions might be so shaped as to avoid the production of criminals and thus secure social advance at a much less expenditure of energy. He sees no connection between economic injustice and crime and evidently seems to think that the only way to eliminate any "unfit" element is to keep on producing it and then kill it when produced. The material gathered is infinitely better than the reasoning about that material, and the book is far more of a contribution to the field of fact than that of theory. Some one should use the very valuable material he has gathered to write a real social theory of crime.

**The Socialist Movement.** By Rev. Charles H. Vail. Paper, 31 pp., 10 cents.

This is an excellent little book to hand to the man who has had his interest aroused by a leaflet, a Socialist newspaper, or a speech and who is willing and able to do a little serious thinking. An immense amount of good, solid thought and reasoning has been crammed within the pages of this work, and it is well worth the reading of even those who think themselves familiar with Socialist doctrines.

## PUBLISHERS' DEPARTMENT

### **Bound Volumes of the Review.**

With the present issue The International Socialist Review starts its third volume. A limited number of the sets of the issues thus far printed have been bound in two handsome volumes, uniform in style, each containing over 800 pages. They constitute a history of International Socialism and of Socialist thought that is unequalled by anything else in the English language, and is on a par with the leading reviews of continental Europe. Volume I., of which less than 200 copies remain, contains the numbers from July, 1900, to June, 1901, and Volume II., just ready, contains the numbers from July, 1901, to June, 1902. The price is \$2.00 a volume, including postage, to any address.

### **Special Limited Offer.**

To any one sending cash with order before August 15, 1902, we will send Volume II., in cloth binding, and a year's subscription for \$2.25, or both bound volumes and a year's subscription for \$3.50. This includes prepayment of expressage on the volumes.

### **Premiums for Three New Subscriptions.**

To any one sending us before August 15 \$3.00 with the names of three new yearly subscribers to The International Socialist Review, we will send either one of the two bound volumes, or, if preferred, a copy of the standard English edition of Marx's Capital, sold by us at \$2.00 and by others at \$2.50. We pay expressage.

### **Trial Subscriptions.**

To introduce The International Socialist Review to new readers, and to provide the best Socialist literature for the fall campaign at the lowest possible cost, we will send the magazine three months to ten names for \$1.00 and to additional names sent in by the same subscriber within a month at the same rate of 10 cents each. This is, of course, much less than the cost of publication, and we can only afford it because experience has shown that a large proportion of the trial



subscribers will stay with us. Every reader of The Review should take this matter up at once. A very little effort will find ten people who will only be too glad to get The Review three months for 10 cents, a third of the regular price. This offer does not apply to Chicago, where we have to pay two cents postage on every copy. Chicago Socialists can, however, get back numbers of The Review for propaganda use at less than cost by calling at our office.

---

### **A New Socialist Drama.**

We have just published a new Socialist drama, entitled "Under the Lash," the author being Comrade C. F. Quinn, of Wilkesbarre, Pa. It is by all odds the strongest dramatic work that the Socialist movement of America has yet produced. The stage setting is simple and the play is well adapted to the needs of amateurs. It has already been successfully produced in Chicago and will be welcomed in other cities. Price 25 cents; no discount except to stockholders. A Socialist club purchasing twelve copies will be permitted to produce the play once. Further productions must be by special arrangement. The author has contributed his share of the profits from the play to assist in the work of Socialist propaganda.

---

### **Campaign Literature.**

We are issuing a new series of four-page propaganda leaflets at less than cost, to assist the work of building up the Socialist party. Five of these leaflets are now ready—"Who Are the Socialists," "A Country Where Strikes Don't Fail," "Why Join the Socialist Party," "Socialism Defined by Socialists," and "Labor Politics." The first four are by Charles H. Kerr, the last by A. M. Simons. The last page of each leaflet is headed with the words, "You are invited to a Socialist meeting at," under which a blank space is left for inserting place and time of meeting with a rubber stamp. For the accommodation of comrades who cannot get rubber stamps of local dealers we will mail a two-line stamp and an inking pad for 30 cents. A plan which has worked well is to select a prominent street corner and hold regular weekly meetings. For example, have your stamps made to read: "Corner of State and Second street; every Saturday evening at 7:30. Then distribute a different leaflet with the same stamping each week and watch the growth of your crowds, your membership and your vote. These leaflets would cost at least \$2.00 a thousand to print in small quantities. Our price is 50 cents a thousand, if we prepay charges, 25 cents a thousand if sent by express at purchaser's expense.

---

### **Socialist Literature for the Striking Coal Miners.**

The work of Mother Jones and other Socialist workers have made the striking coal-miners ready and anxious to learn more of Socialism. Several active comrades are now working with every energy at their



disposal to show the miners the way to end all strikes and industrial slavery. But something more permanent than the spoken word is needed, if that word is to have its best effect. Every Socialist speaker in the mines at present is sorely in need of Socialist literature. More important still, there are hundreds of Socialists in the mining fields who are not public speakers, but who, if supplied with plenty of good literature would become centers of effective Socialist propaganda. Funds for such literature must come from outside the strike field. The publishers of this Review have already done something in the way of sending such literature to those who are in need of it. We could do infinitely more had we the necessary funds. So we are asking the readers of the International Socialist Review to help us with whatever sums they can afford, to be expended for Socialist books and pamphlets. For all sums that are sent us we will mail as much literature as it will pay for at our stockholders' prices. As these prices are practically at cost of production, a few dollars will supply a great amount of reading matter. Do not wait, but send in what you can afford at once as time is precious. Add a dollar at least to your next book order, or send in a dollar or more without waiting for any other order. All money will be receipted for through the columns of the International Socialist Review.

### **Marx's Capital.**

---

Our imported edition of Marx's Capital is now ready. It is the best edition published, printed from the plates which were made under the personal supervision of Frederick Engels. The price in England is half a guinea, in New York \$2.50. Our price is \$2.00 postpaid; to our stockholders \$1.30 by mail or \$1.00 by express, at purchaser's expense; \$10.00 down or \$2.00 a month for five months makes you a full-paid stockholder in our co-operative company, with no liability of any kind, and with the privilege of buying all our books at cost price.

CHARLES H. KERR & COMPANY, Publishers,  
56 Fifth Avenue, Chicago.